

The
HOMILETIC
WRITINGS
of
ARCHBISHOP
WULFSTAN

Joyce Tally Lionarons

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

THE HOMILETIC WRITINGS OF ARCHBISHOP WULFSTAN

The prodigious writings of Archbishop Wulfstan (d. 1023) encompass secular laws, religious canons, political theory, and homilies (sermons); despite their importance, however, the homilies have not received the critical attention they deserve, a gap which this book seeks to fill. It focuses on three particular aspects: the re-establishment of the Wulfstan homiletic canon, Wulfstan's processes of composition and revision as manifested in their manuscript variants, and Wulfstan's characteristic themes and concerns. These include adherence to secular and divine law; the keeping of Christian feasts and fasts; the payment of church dues and tithes; social justice for the poor; absolute clerical celibacy and sexual continence for the laity; repentance, prayer and penance; and the continual reminder, both pre- and post-millennium, that the end of the world is close at hand. Wulfstan's homilies indicate that for the English to heed his warnings, they would have to be persuaded or, if necessary, legally coerced into adhering to the dictates of a 'Holy Society'; and their influence can be seen in his law codes, where the book argues that even in coercion the archbishop sought to teach and to persuade.

JOYCE TALLY LIONARONS teaches in the English Department at Ursinus College, Pennsylvania.

Anglo-Saxon Studies

ISSN 1475–2468

General Editors

John Hines

Catherine Cubitt

'Anglo-Saxon Studies' aims to provide a forum for the best scholarship on the Anglo-Saxon peoples in the period from the end of Roman Britain to the Norman Conquest, including comparative studies involving adjacent populations and periods; both new research and major re-assessments of central topics are welcomed.

Books in the series may be based in any one of the principal disciplines of archaeology, art history, history, language and literature, and inter- or multi-disciplinary studies are encouraged.

Proposals or enquiries may be sent directly to the editors or the publisher at the addresses given below; all submissions will receive prompt and informed consideration.

Professor John Hines, Cardiff School of History and Archaeology, Cardiff University, Colum Drive, Cardiff, Wales, CF10 3EU

Dr Catherine Cubitt, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of York, The King's Manor, York, England, YO1 7EP

Boydell & Brewer, PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk, England, IP12 3DF

Previously published volumes in the series are listed at the back of this book

THE HOMILETIC WRITINGS OF ARCHBISHOP WULFSTAN

A CRITICAL STUDY

Joyce Tally Lionarons

D. S. BREWER

© Joyce Tally Lionarons 2010

All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner

The right of Joyce Tally Lionarons to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988

First published 2010
D. S. Brewer, Woodbridge

ISBN 978-1-84384-256-9

D. S. Brewer is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
668 Mt Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620, USA

website: www.boydellandbrewer.com

The publisher has no responsibility for the continued existence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

A catalogue record of this publication is available
from the British Library

This publication is printed on acid-free paper

Typeset by Word and Page, Chester
Printed in Great Britain by
CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham and Eastbourne

Contents

Acknowledgements	vi
Abbreviations	vii
Manuscript Sigla	viii
Introduction	1
1. Wulfstan and Wulfstan Manuscripts	9
2. Re-establishing the Wulfstanian Homiletic Canon	23
3. Wulfstan's Eschatology	43
4. Salvation History and Christianity	75
5. Wulfstan as Archbishop	108
6. Sacramental Sermons	123
7. The Danish Invasions and the <i>Sermo Lupi ad Anglos</i>	147
8. Homilies Based on Legal Codes and the <i>Institutes of Polity</i>	172
Bibliography	177
Index	189

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the librarians and library staff of the British Library, the Parker Library at Cambridge (with special thanks to Gill Cannel), Duke Humphrey's Library at Oxford, and the Royal Library at Copenhagen for allowing me access to their Wulfstan manuscripts; I am grateful to Ursinus College for giving me the time and travel funding to work in these libraries. I owe a huge debt of gratitude to Paul Szarmach and Timothy Graham for introducing me to manuscript study at a National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminar years ago. I would also like to thank the numerous people who have given me encouragement and advice during the writing of this book: Jon Wilcox, Andy Orchard, Patrick Wormald, Allen Frantzen, Carolin Esser, Renee Trilling, John Strassburger, Judy Levy, Carol Dole, Patti Schroeder, Becky Jaroff, Matt Kozusko, Liz Ho, Meredith Goldsmith, Nzadi Keita, Jon Volkmer, Amir Hussain, Barbara von Schlegell, and Margie Connor. My upper-division Old English students helped me clarify my thoughts on the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, and I remember the class fondly whenever I work on the sermon. I thank the anonymous readers from Boydell & Brewer Press, as well as Caroline Palmer, best of editors.

Parts of Chapters 2 and 3 are based on my article, 'Textual Appropriation and Scribal (Re)Performance in a Composite Homily: The Case for a New Edition of Wulfstan's *De Temporibus Anticristi*' in *Old English Literature in its Manuscript Context*, ed. Joyce Tally Lionarons, West Virginia University Press, 2004, pp. 67–93. Parts of Chapters 2 and 5 were published in my article, 'Textual Identity, Homiletic Reception, and Wulfstan's *Sermo ad Populum*', *Review of English Studies* 55 (2004), 157–82; and parts of Chapters 5 and 8 are based on my article 'Napier Homily L: Wulfstan's Eschatology at the End of His Career' in *Archbishop Wulfstan of York*, ed. Matthew Townend, Brill, 2007, pp. 413–28. I am grateful to all three publishers for permission to use these articles here.

Abbreviations

Bethurum	<i>The Homilies of Wulfstan</i> , ed. Dorothy Bethurum (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957, repr. 1998)
EETS	Early English Text Society os Original Series ss Supplementary Series
Gneuss	Helmut Gneuss, <i>Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100</i> (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001)
Ker	N. R. Ker, <i>Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), usually cited by item number.
Napier	<i>Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit</i> , ed. Arthur Napier (Berlin: Weidmann, 1883)
PL	J. P. Migne, ed., <i>Patrologiae cursus completus . . . series Latina</i> , 122 vols. (Paris, 1844–55), cited by volume and column
Townend, <i>Wulfstan</i>	<i>Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference</i> , ed. Matthew Townend (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004)

Manuscript Sigla

A	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 421
B	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 419
Bar	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 37
C	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201, pp. 1–178
Cop	Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. Kgl. S. 1595
D	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 302
E	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113
F	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 114
G	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121
H	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343
I	London, British Library, Cotton Nero A.i
K	London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.iii
L	London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.xiii
M	London, British Library, Cotton Otho B.x
N	London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra B.xiii
Pem	Cambridge, Pembroke College, 25
R	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115
Rou	Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1382 (U. 109), fols. 173 ^r –198 ^v
V	London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D.ii
Vesp	London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A.xiv
W	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 190
X	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 265
Y	York, Minster Library, Add. 1

Introduction

A LONG with his contemporary and correspondent Ælfric of Eynsham, Archbishop Wulfstan of York (d. 1023) is one of two named writers of vernacular homilies in late Anglo-Saxon England. In comparison to Ælfric, however, Wulfstan has fared relatively poorly at the hands of scholars in the past half-century or so. The standard edition of his works, edited by Dorothy Bethurum in 1957,¹ is outdated and incomplete; Arthur Napier's 1886 edition,² on the other hand, contains many homilies that are not Wulfstan's and is lacking its projected companion volume of critical apparatus and commentary. The single book-length study of Wulfstan's homiletic writing, Karl Jost's 1950 *Wulfstanstudien*,³ although still invaluable for Jost's exemplary source-study, has in many ways been superseded by later work. After the groundbreaking work of the 1950s, scholarship on Wulfstan's homilies throughout the second half of the twentieth century consisted of numerous, but often widely scattered, articles, along with portions of books otherwise devoted to other topics and writers. Today, however, interest in Wulfstan is at a high not reached since the days of Bethurum, Jost, and Dorothy Whitelock. A volume of proceedings from the Second Alcuin Conference at the University of York, devoted entirely to Wulfstan, appeared in 2002, and a new edition of Wulfstan's homilies is in preparation.⁴ Patrick Wormald's monumental *The Making of English Law* has set a standard for scholarship that few can hope to equal, but by its nature his study deals with the homilies only where they intersect with the laws. A critical study of the homilies is long overdue.

This book provides such a study, focusing on three aspects of Wulfstan's work: 1. extant Wulfstan manuscripts and the re-establishment of the Wulfstan homiletic canon; 2. Wulfstan's processes of composition and revision as manifested in manuscript variants of the homilies; and 3. Wulfstan's characteristic themes and concerns, which include eschatology, the education and behavior of both clergy and laity, penance, baptism, and the relationship between church and state.

Chapter 1 examines the manuscripts associated with Wulfstan either through his own handwriting or through their contents: these include not only the homiletic manuscripts *per se*, but also those manuscripts containing

¹ Dorothy Bethurum, ed., *The Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957).

² Arthur Napier, ed., *Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1883).

³ Karl Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, Swiss Studies in English 23 (Bern: Francke, 1950).

⁴ Matthew Townend, ed., *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004).

Wulfstan's legal writings and the *Institutes of Polity*, along with the so-called 'commonplace book' manuscripts that contain many of his source materials. The necessity of considering manuscript context when writing about medieval literature has been argued so often in recent years that it needs little explanation or rationale;⁵ in the case of Wulfstan, that necessity is compounded by the archbishop's incessant revision and rewriting of his works, and by the consequent efforts by editors like Dorothy Bethurum to erase the evidence of such rewriting to produce a corpus of finished, polished sermons. The chapter establishes the relationship between Wulfstan and his manuscripts as well as the relationships among the manuscripts and their contents.

Chapter 2 focuses on the re-establishment of the Wulfstan homiletic canon. Only recently have scholars come to realize that making a hard and fast distinction between genres has blurred our understanding that Wulfstan's writings are of a piece, and it is the failure to recognize this fact that led earlier editors and commentators like Jost and Bethurum astray. Jost did not believe Wulfstan to be responsible for Cnut's laws, and he was therefore obliged to attribute a number of Wulfstan's homilies to so-called 'Wulfstan-imitators'. Bethurum acknowledged Wulfstan's legal writings as authorial; however, she made a sharp distinction between Wulfstan's homilies and his other writings, and she thus excluded a number of homilies from her edition because of their reliance on the laws or *Polity* and excised portions of others to remove passages that she considered non-homiletic. But as Patrick Wormald has demonstrated in *The Making of English Law*,⁶ Wulfstan did not make modern differentiations between genres in his writing: his law codes underlie many passages in the homilies, the homilies contribute to the law codes, and both draw on his political theory as laid out in *Polity*. This chapter builds on the exemplary work done by Jonathan Wilcox⁷ and others in order to provide a detailed examination of a number of homilies and homiletic fragments excluded by Bethurum from her edition on the grounds of genre in light of recent scholarship and contemporary editorial theory.

The remaining chapters focus on the homilies themselves. Wulfstan established his reputation as an outstanding orator and rhetorical stylist in a series of eschatological homilies begun during his tenure as bishop of London (996–1002);⁸ he ended his career some twenty-odd years later as archbishop of York and elder statesman of Cnut's regime, author of the king's law codes and architect of what he hoped would become, in Patrick Wormald's phrase,

⁵ For the seminal study in this regard, see Fred Robinson, 'Old English Literature in its Most Immediate Context', in *Old English Literature in Context: Ten Essays*, ed. John D. Niles (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1980), pp. 11–29, 157–61.

⁶ Patrick Wormald, *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century*, Vol. I, *Legislation and its Limits* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999).

⁷ Jonathan Wilcox, 'The Dissemination of Wulfstan's Homilies', in *England in the Eleventh Century*, ed. Carola Hicks (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1992), pp. 199–217.

⁸ See, for example, Dorothy Whitelock, 'Archbishop Wulfstan, Homilist and Statesman', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th series, 24 (1942), p. 39; Dorothy Whitelock, ed., *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* (3rd edn, London: Methuen, 1963), p. 10; and Bethurum, pp. 101–2.

a 'Holy Society'.⁹ At his death in 1023, he left behind an impressive body of Latin and vernacular writing, including law codes, collections of canon law, homilies, and an outline of the ideal Christian society in the *Institutes of Polity*. Little of this material is identified in the manuscripts as having been composed by Wulfstan (or *Lupus*, his pen name), but all is written in his distinctive rhetorical style. Wormald has suggested that Wulfstan studies were slow to develop in part because of 'a failure to discover the source of the power that drove him' and in part because of an unnecessary bifurcation of Wulfstan's twin roles as homilist and statesman.¹⁰ Certainly those roles were rarely if ever separated in Wulfstan's mind or in his works: his law codes became increasingly homiletic in tone and structure as the reign of Æthelred gave way to that of Cnut, while his homilies in turn became legalistic in terminology and method. The same themes recur in both: loyalty to God and king; adherence to secular and divine law; the keeping of Christian feasts and fasts; the payment of church dues and tithes; social justice for the poor; almsgiving; absolute clerical celibacy and sexual continence for the laity; repentance, prayer, and penance; and the continual reminder – both pre- and post-millennium – that the end of the world is close at hand.

As for the power that drove him, Wormald argues that Wulfstan was motivated by his 'growing vision of a Holy Society', and he suggests that the culmination of the archbishop's career came in Cnut's code of 1020/1021, which may be seen as a blueprint for 'the sort of society [Wulfstan] was sure that the kingdom of the English had to be, if they were to keep the terms of the Covenant whereby (as Bede had shown) God allowed them to occupy their beautiful island, and if they were after all to avoid the fate of their backsliding British predecessors'.¹¹ Cnut's code, with its implicit call for a reordering of society, may therefore be contrasted to Wulfstan's 1008 code for Æthelred, in which 'the millenarian expectations which had powered the homilies that made his name were still throbbing'.¹² The contrast makes it clear that Wormald assumes Wulfstan's thought underwent a fundamental change during the Danish invasions: 'from 1014 at least, his *oeuvre* aimed to reorder society such that it would never again merit the punishment meted out by God in that grim year'.¹³

The change to which Wormald alludes is detailed by Malcolm Godden, who argues that the three successive versions of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* demonstrate how the impact of the Danish invasions forced Wulfstan to rethink the eschatological expectations of his earliest homilies. Although Wulfstan initially placed the invasions within a New Testament paradigm of the end of the world, identifying them 'with the turmoil and tribulation

⁹ Patrick Wormald, 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Holiness of Society', in *Anglo-Saxon History: Basic Readings*, ed. David A. E. Pelteret (New York: Garland, 1999), pp. 191–224.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 192. The division of 'homilist' and 'statesman' is, of course, taken from the title of Dorothy Whitelock's article.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 206. The 1008 code is VI Æthelred.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 208.

which, according to the Gospels, or rather medieval interpretation of them, would precede Antichrist's time;¹⁴ the *Sermo Lupi* demonstrates that he had begun to see them as part of a different paradigm, derived from the Old Testament, that cast the English as God's chosen people, suffering divine retribution for their sins in an ongoing cycle of punishment and repentance.¹⁵ The result is that 'The sense of an approaching end of all things, so strong in the earlier homilies on the last days and still very evident in the first version of the [*Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*], gives way to a sense of the longer and continuing movement of history'.¹⁶

In Chapter 3 I argue that Wulfstan's thought on divine retribution and the final days, however, was neither simple nor compartmentalized into discrete paradigms. As early as *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi* (Bethurum homily VI; Napier homily 2,¹⁷ c.1006), Wulfstan made effective use of the Old Testament paradigm in conjunction with an eschatological conclusion; while in the final years of his life, he employed the New Testament paradigm for a last eschatological warning in Napier homily 50. Napier 50 combines the Old and New Testament paradigms of history much more successfully than the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, despite the fact that its rhetorical and literary qualities are as a whole inferior to those of the earlier sermon.¹⁸ Composed after the accession of Cnut, and certainly no earlier than the 1018 meeting of Cnut's *witan* at Oxford,¹⁹ Napier 50 is based in large part on the conviction that the Danish wars had been God's just punishment for the sins of the English and that such punishment could be revisited upon them if they do not repent and atone – the Old Testament paradigm. At the same time, however, Wulfstan repeatedly invokes the image of the end of the world and the Last Judgment, admonishing the lay aristocracy to atone for their sins if they want *on þam miclan dæge heom sylfum gebeorgan bet þonne þa dydon þe beforan wæron* (Napier 268/10–11, 'to protect themselves better on that great day than did those who came before them') and reminding the secular clergy of the reward they can expect from God (*hwylces leanes hig him wenan magon*, 270/25–6) unless they too repent and atone, assuring them that it will be an evil one (*hig yfel lean habban scylan*, 270/27). The homily ends with a passage devoted entirely to eschatological themes, comprised for the most part of sentences taken from three of Wulfstan's earlier eschatological homilies, but with the addition of a substantially new passage reminding his audience of the sorrow and evil of this world and allowing for the possibility that its end, although inevitable

¹⁴ Malcolm Godden, 'Apocalypse and Invasion in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *From Anglo-Saxon to Early Middle English: Studies Presented to E. G. Stanley*, ed. Malcolm Godden, Douglas Gray, and Terry Hoad (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 154.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

¹⁷ Bethurum, pp. 142–56; Napier, pp. 6–20. Quotations from Wulfstan's homilies are cited by edition, page, and line number; translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own.

¹⁸ Napier, pp. 266–74. See especially the concluding passage beginning on 272/26.

¹⁹ Bethurum (p. 40) dates the text to sometime after 1020; Patrick Wormald, however, places it two to three years earlier, regarding the sermon as associated with Cnut's 1018 Oxford code and as a possible source-text for I Cnut. See Wormald, *Making of English Law*, pp. 335, 356–60.

and perhaps nearer than they think, may yet be delayed a little while. The passage reflects both the broader view of history that Wulfstan gained during the course of the Danish wars and his long-held conviction that the world is degenerating as it hastens towards its end. Most importantly, Wulfstan uses the passage effectively to turn the competing Old and New Testament paradigms of history into a single, albeit double-edged, warning: if the end of all things is delayed and people do not repent and atone for their sins, they may expect the same sort of punishment to be visited upon them as afflicted those who came before; if not, the imminent arrival of the final days makes the need for repentance even more pressing. Clearly Wulfstan's journey was not simply from one position to another during the course of the Danish wars: Chapter 2 traces the evolution of his thought from the earliest of the eschatological homilies through the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* to its culmination in Napier 50.

For the English to heed Wulfstan's warnings of the coming end – whether in the 990s or the 1020s – they would first have to be taught to comprise the Holy Society that Wulfstan spent his life working towards, and then persuaded or if necessary legally coerced into adhering to its dictates, and the clear homiletic element in his law codes demonstrates that even in coercion Wulfstan sought to teach and to persuade. The idea of Wulfstan as primarily a teacher belies the all too common impression that the archbishop had 'a maximum of two voices: loud and louder',²⁰ an impression that stems from too narrow a focus on the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* and the early eschatological homilies. In contrast, a reading of the full corpus of Wulfstan's homiletic writings confirms that the dominant voice of his work, while admittedly hortatory, is catechetical and didactic rather than merely paranetic, and also reveals a clear pattern with regard to content. While the eschatological homilies repeatedly urge the faithful to do what is necessary (*don swa . . . þearfis*) to prepare themselves to resist the temptations of Antichrist, that is, *lufian God ofer ealle oðre þing 7 his wyllan wyrcan* (Bethurum V, 122/70–1; VI, 126/77, 'to love God above all else and to do his will'),²¹ their priests are exhorted to warn of the coming end and to teach Christians their faith, *þe læs ðe hit geweorðe þæt purh larleste godes folc losie* (Bethurum Ib, 117/19–118/30, 'lest it happen that through lack of instruction God's people are lost'). The majority of Wulfstan's sermons – the specifically catechetical homilies, those centered around Wulfstan's episcopal and archiepiscopal duties, and those based on his legal codes and the *Institutes of Polity* – are aimed at providing both clergy and laity with the necessary tools to do God's will: a basic understanding of their faith, its scriptures, and its sacraments, along with the obligations and duties of each stratum of society. For Wulfstan, living up to his own exhortations concerning the

²⁰ Andy Orchard, 'Re-editing Wulfstan: Where's the Point?', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 63–91, at p. 64. In an expression of the more usual evaluation of Wulfstan's work, Karen Louise Jolly compares Wulfstan and Ælfric: '[Ælfric's] goal was to upgrade the priests in their behavior and knowledge so that they could properly lead the lay people into a right understanding of Christian truth. While Wulfstan also had these same goals, he accomplished them mostly by commanding' (*Popular Religion in Late Saxon England: Elf Charms in Context* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 79).

²¹ The phrase is, of course, used throughout Wulfstan's later homilies.

final days required not only educating the laity about their faith and how to profess it correctly, but also providing instruction and homiletic models for a chronically undereducated priesthood. It was the task of a lifetime, and Wulfstan spent his life in an attempt to accomplish it.

Chapters 4–8 provide in-depth analysis of those homilies, paying close attention to manuscript variants and contexts that illuminate the stages of Wulfstan's process of composition. Andy Orchard has recently pointed out that 'to read and edit Wulfstan is to appreciate the value of works in progress, of works unfinished and amalgamated, works (and words) that have passed through several ears and mouths and hands'.²² Wulfstan habitually reuses his own sentences and phrases, sometimes verbatim, more often with changes that indicate that he is quoting himself from memory or simply expressing the same idea in similar terms. His use of external sources follows the same pattern: he quotes or translates verbatim in early drafts of works, revises to cast his sources into his own distinctive style, and then reuses his revisions in later homilies. Yet an appreciation of Wulfstan's 'works in progress' is virtually impossible if one reads Bethurum's edition of the homilies in isolation, as her edition provides only finished texts, with any 'amalgamated' passages – from Wulfstan's sources and from his own 'non-homiletic' works – editorially removed.

Chapter 4 treats the homilies designed to teach the basics of the Christian faith to both lay and clerical audiences. These homilies lay particular emphasis on salvation history, the importance of the Creed and Pater Noster, and the problem of the persistence of superstitious, pagan-derived practices. My analysis sets the homilies in the context of an examination of the state of learning in the secular church during Wulfstan's tenure as archbishop, particularly the extent to which priests could be expected to know and make use of the Latin texts necessary to carry out their ecclesiastical duties, as well as the extent to which lay parishioners were expected to know and understand their faith. Because several of the homilies are basically Wulfstan's rewritings of Ælfrician texts, the chapter also examines the literary relationship between Wulfstan and Ælfric and the use Wulfstan makes of Ælfric's work.

Chapter 5 looks at the homilies arising from Wulfstan's work as bishop and archbishop, including his sermons for the consecration of a church and bishop and his Pastoral Letter. Both the *Lectio secundum Lucam* for the consecration of a bishop and the Letter are extant in complex manuscript contexts that are examined in detail to arrive at the text(s) that Wulfstan most likely composed, and the order in which he revised and expanded them. Particular attention is paid to the performativity of the *Lectio secundum Lucam*, a sermon that demonstrates, perhaps more than any of the homilies, Wulfstan's mastery of the art of preaching.

Chapter 6 discusses homilies and other writings concerning the two

²² Andy Orchard, 'On Editing Wulfstan', in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), p. 326.

sacraments that Wulfstan was apparently most interested in: baptism, which brought people into the Christian community; and penance, which reconciled them with that community when they had become estranged from it through sin. Wulfstan's sermons on baptism suggest that he expected priests in his dioceses to conduct both infant and adult baptisms; moreover, he apparently regarded confirmation of baptism by a bishop as a separate sacrament. His penitential writings involve individual, public, and communal penance, but all emphasize the benefits that accrue to both individuals and the community as a whole from any of the penitential actions. A case is made in this chapter for Wulfstan's authorship of two sections of the *Handbook for the Use of a Confessor*, a work which was most likely compiled and edited by the archbishop. Finally, the chapter argues that these homilies are themselves catechetical: Wulfstan uses the homilies on both sacraments and by implication their occasions to instruct the larger community on the meaning and importance of the rituals and the obligations they impose on the recipients and (in the case of baptism) the sponsors alike.

Chapter 7 treats Wulfstan's most famous homily, the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, placing it in the context of Wulfstan's other writings that indicate the archbishop's response to the Danish invasions, notably the 'penitential edict' found in VII Æthelred and its homiletic reflexes in Napier homilies 35 and 36. The chapter examines not only the three versions of the *Sermo Lupi* provided by Bethurum, but also Wulfstan's condensation of the text as found in Napier homily 27. The historical background of the two dates in the manuscripts, 1009 and 1014, provides a new insight into the possibilities not only for dating the sermon, but also for the order of composition: if Wulfstan began writing the homily in 1009, as historical circumstances and the manuscript evidence suggests, neither the BH version nor the EI version could have been first. Particular notice is given to Malcolm Godden's assertion that Wulfstan's view of history underwent a change during course of the Danish invasions from a New Testament paradigm that saw the invasions as a precursor to the end of the world to an Old Testament paradigm of sin, repentance, and reconciliation.

Chapter 8 examines the specific homilies and homiletic fragments excluded by Bethurum because of their reliance on Wulfstan's law codes and the *Institutes of Polity*. The chapter reconsiders the question of genre and analyzes the relationship between homily and law code, church and state, as Wulfstan conceived it in his works. Most important among these homilies and thus singled out for particular attention are Napier homilies 50 and 51, both sermons addressed to meetings of the *witan* and both intimately connected to the promulgation of Cnut's laws. Napier 50 is especially interesting because of its reiteration of Wulfstan's eschatological ideas, albeit with changes produced by the intervening years. The fragmentary homiletic texts found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121 within the larger text of Wulfstan's *Institutes of Polity* are also of special importance here, as many of them provide a compositional bridge between Wulfstan's formal homilies and his political theory.

Taken together, the homilies show a man driven to create the Holy Society that Wormald suggests. Yet if there is an urge behind the power driving Wulfstan in his writing, it lies in the unshaken belief that world is indeed in haste and nearing its end. Only a Holy Society could face with confidence the unspeakable terrors of the Final Days.

Wulfstan and Wulfstan Manuscripts

WULFSTAN was consecrated bishop of London in 996; in 1002 he was elevated to bishop of Worcester and archbishop of York, holding the two sees in plurality until his resignation of Worcester in 1016, and continuing as archbishop of York until his death in May 1023. What little we know of his life has been gleaned from relatively few sources: charters dating from 996 through 1023 bear his signature,¹ and he is mentioned by name four times in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*: at his accession to the bishopric of London (F 996), celebrating the consecration of Cnut's church at Ashingdon (D 1020), consecrating Æthelnoth as archbishop of Canterbury (F 1020), and at his death (E 1023). In addition, he almost certainly performed the consecration of Ælfwig as bishop of London, reported in D 1014, since the ceremony was performed at York.² The twelfth-century *Liber Eliensis* lists him as a patron and benefactor; he was also a benefactor of Peterborough, and it is possible that he had been educated at one of the two abbeys.³ He was buried at Ely in 1023, apparently to the dismay of Peterborough, and at the completion of Ely cathedral in c.1054 his remains, along with those of six other benefactors, were translated from the abbey chapel to the north wall of the cathedral choir.⁴ A second translation in 1771 to accommodate the rebuilding of the choir placed the seven where they remain today, in Bishop West's chapel in the southeast corner of the cathedral. Before the north wall was demolished, however, there had been effigies in the form of wall paintings above each of the graves, and two eighteenth-century reproductions of Wulfstan's painting survive, each depicting the seated archbishop with mitre and staff: the first, a pen-and-ink drawing by William Stuckey dated c.1735–41, the second a watercolor made by Michael Tyson in 1789.⁵ A single artifact in the form

¹ Simon Keynes, *The Diplomas of King Æthelred 'the Unready', 978–1016: A Study in their Use as Historical Evidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), p. 190.

² Charles Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel, with Supplementary Extracts from the Others* (Oxford, 1892–9); Simon Keynes and David Dumville, eds., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1983–).

³ Wormald, 'Archbishop Wulfstan', p. 13.

⁴ The six include five bishops: Æthelstan (Elmham, d. 1001), Ælfgar (Elmham, d. c.1021), Ælfwin (Elmham, resigned 1029, death date unknown), Eadnoth (Dorchester, d. 1016), and Osmund (Swedish, d. c.1067 at Ely); the sixth is Ealdorman Byrhtnoth, killed at the Battle of Maldon (991). For a full discussion, see John Crook, 'Vir optimus Wlstanus: The Post-Conquest Commemoration of Archbishop Wulfstan of York at Ely Cathedral', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 501–24.

⁵ For the Tyson, see Oxford, Bodleian Library, Gough Maps 225, fol. 37r; for the Stuckey, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Top. Eccles. d.6, p. 88. See Crook, 'Vir optimus', pp. 509–10 for illustrations.

of a bronze pin with traces of silver found in the archbishop's grave also survives; it was apparently one of several gilt *spinulae* used to attach the pall to his chasuble at his burial.⁶

The *Liber Eliensis* also makes it clear that Ely attempted to profit from the burial by creating a Wulfstan cult, claiming that miracles were frequently reported at his grave (*sepe contingebant miracula*).⁷ These include the preservation of his chasuble, stole and maniple despite the decay of the body, and the cure of foul diseases (*turpibus morbis*); in addition, the text relates that Wulfstan miraculously predicted his own burial in the abbey when, on a visit to the church at Ely, he leaned on his staff and it suddenly sank into the ground almost to its middle (*subito baculus pene ad medium sui terram intravit*).⁸ Nor is the book hesitant to capitalize on Wulfstan's political stature: noting that he lived during the times of Æthelred, Edmund, and Cnut, the author calls him the most learned of counselors (*doctissimus consiliarius*) and asserts that each of the three kings loved him as a brother and honored him as a father (*amabatur ut frater, eque honorabatur ut pater*).⁹

More important and certainly more durable than Ely's short-lived attempt to inaugurate a cult of the archbishop, however, are the writings we can associate with Wulfstan and the manuscripts in which they have been preserved. As noted earlier, very few works are explicitly identified as Wulfstan's in the manuscripts; rather, the canon of his writings has been established through recognition of the archbishop's distinctive stylistic traits. Chief among these is his characteristic two-stress rhythm,¹⁰ often accompanied by alliteration or rhyme and at times approaching verse. His vocabulary is likewise distinctive, made more so by the fact that it is relatively small – much smaller than, for example, Ælfric's.¹¹ Wulfstan always uses *lagu*, not *æ*, for 'law'; and most often *beorgan*, not *arian*, for 'preserve'; *gesælig*, not *eadig*, for 'blessed'; *dryhten*, not *hælend*, for 'lord'; Scandinavian-influenced words in addition to *lagu* include *þræl* ('thrall'), *grið* ('truce', 'peace'), and *wælcýrie* ('valkyrie').¹² In addition, Wulfstan's writing utilizes a large number of intensifiers, typically *swyðe* ('greatly'), *ealles* to *swyðe* ('all too greatly'), *georne* ('eagerly', 'earnestly'), *wide* ('widely'), and *witod/witodlice* ('certain/certainly'); as well as compounds in which the first element – often *þeod* ('nation'), *riht* ('right'), or *woruld* ('world') – is

⁶ Crook, 'Vir optimus', p. 517. See also A. Way, *Catalogue of Antiquities, Coins, Pictures, and Miscellaneous Curiosities in the Possession of the Society of Antiquaries of London* (London, 1847), pp. 21–2.

⁷ E. O. Blake, ed., *Liber Eliensis* (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1962), p. 157.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

¹⁰ For a full discussion, see Angus McIntosh, 'Wulfstan's Prose', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 35 (1949), 109–42.

¹¹ Andy Orchard, 'Wulfstan as Reader, Writer, and Rewriter', in Aaron J. Kleist, ed., *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), pp. 320–1.

¹² See Bethurum, pp. 90–2, and Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, pp. 17–19, for these and other examples. See also Sara M. Pons-Sanz, 'A Reconsideration of Wulfstan's Use of Norse-Derived Terms: The Case of *þræl*', *English Studies* 88 (2007), 1–21, and *Norse-Derived Vocabulary in Late Old English Texts: Wulfstan's Works, A Case Study* (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2007).

meant to intensify, as in *peodlicetere* ('arch-hypocrite'), *peodwita* ('learned man', 'national spokesman'), *rihtlæce* ('qualified physician'), *rihtlicetere* ('downright hypocrite'), *woruldscamu* ('public shame') and *woruldstrudere* ('looter', 'robber'). He is fond of paranomastic wordplay and constructions in which one element echoes another, for example, *Se þe wære lofgeorn for idelan weorðscype, weorðe se carfull hu he swypast mæge gecweman his drihtne* ('He who is fond of idle honors must be careful how he can most please his lord') and *Se þe wære ofermod, weorðe he eadmod* ('He who is proud should become humble').¹³ Also characteristic is the use of the adverbial *to* ('too') in litotic constructions like *ne beon . . . to swicole ne to ficole* (Bethurum 183/154–8, 'do not be . . . too deceitful nor too untrustworthy').

Wulfstan's two-stress rhythm leads him to the frequent use of tautological or contrastive pairings such as *to hæbbenne and to healdenne* ('to have and to hold') or *mid word and mid weorc* ('with words and with works'). Other favorite constructions include *oft and gelome* ('often and frequently'), *gime se þe wille* ('let him take heed who will'), *gecnaþe se þe cunne* (let him understand who is able to'), and *for gode and for worulde* ('for God and the world'). The opening to his homilies is inevitably *Leofan men* ('beloved people'); frequently this phrase recurs both at paragraph breaks in longer homilies and at the end preceding an admonition in the form of *utan* ('let us') followed by an infinitive. This phrase in particular functions in what Mary Swan has called the 'performativity' of Wulfstan's sermons to establish the relationship between preacher and congregation: like Ælfric's *men þa leofestan* ('most beloved people'), *leofan men* both 'positions the preacher as the person who can define the audience; [and] groups the audience as a uniform set of people, all defined as "loved" (by . . . God or the preacher or both)'.¹⁴ The repetition of the phrase throughout his sermons and particularly at the end serves not only to reiterate the initial positioning, but also to remind the congregation that, no matter how harsh the preacher's condemnation of their (imputed) sins or how terrifying the possible punishments, the love of God (and archbishop) is enough to show them the way towards repentance and atonement.

Wulfstan constantly recycles his writing, re-using phrases, clauses, and entire passages from earlier homilies in later ones; so much so that Andy Orchard has called repetition the 'essence' of Wulfstan's style¹⁵ – perhaps another drawback in contemporary critical culture, which tends to favor the unique and the new. In the early-medieval church, however, where religious instruction of the laity took place primarily from the pulpit, such repetition performed important cultural work. As Clare Lees reminds us, 'belief is . . . constructed by means of a process of continual reiteration'.¹⁶ Therefore, she

¹³ Don Chapman, 'Germanic Tradition and Latin Learning in Wulfstan's Echoic Compounds', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 101 (2002), 1–18.

¹⁴ Mary Swan, 'Constructing Preacher and Audience in Old English Homilies', in *Constructing the Medieval Sermon*, ed. Roger Andersson (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), pp. 177–88, at pp. 181–2. I am not as certain as Swan that the Old English word *men* is gender-specific, and have thus omitted her third function, that the phrase(s) establish the audience as made up of men.

¹⁵ Andy Orchard, 'Wulfstan as Reader, Writer, and Rewriter', p. 320.

¹⁶ Clare A. Lees, *Tradition and Belief: Religious Writing in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Minneapolis:

continues, 'it would be a mistake to read repetition as narrowly didactic, that is, redundantly dogmatic. . . . repetition and variation of key ideas is an index of a process of believing that is never taken for granted and, therefore, never completed. Repetition maintains dogma.'¹⁷ Verbal repetition is only the beginning, however, for faith in its turn relies upon repeated acts of worship. Thus Wulfstan's habitual use of *leofan men* followed by *utan* and an infinitive temporarily collapses the differentiation between preacher and audience in communal acts of worship, prayer, and repentance. Wulfstan's homilies construct the faith of his congregation and in doing so binds them together into a single political-religious community.

The Manuscripts

Wulfstan's handwriting is nearly as distinctive as his prose. In 1971 Neil Ker listed and described ten manuscripts containing corrections, annotations, and sometimes lines of text in a hand he identified as Wulfstan's own.¹⁸ Although none may be characterized as homiliaries, six of the ten contain one or more of Wulfstan's homilies or homiletic fragments; likewise, some of Wulfstan's legal manuscripts or the so-called 'commonplace book' manuscripts contain a few homilies or homiletic fragments. However, the manuscripts containing the majority of Wulfstan's homilies were copied well after the archbishop's death; if Wulfstan ever intended to provide a complete collection of his sermons on the order of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, it has not survived. Two manuscripts contain the majority of Wulfstan's vernacular homilies: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113 (E); and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201 (C). Also important are Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 419 (B) and 421 (A); London, British Library, Cotton Nero A.i (I) and Tiberius A.iii (K); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodleian 343 (H) and Junius 121 (G); and York, Minster Library, Add. 1 (Y). Additional manuscripts containing one or two homilies or homiletic fragments include Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 190 (W), 265 (X), and 302 (D); Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. Kgl. S. 1595 (Cop); London, British Library, Add. 38651, Cotton Cleopatra B.xiii (N), Otho B.x (M), Tiberius A.xiii (L), Vespasian A.xiv (Vesp) and D.ii (V); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 37 (Bar), and Hatton 114 (F). In discussing the manuscripts I have, where possible, used the sigla from Dorothy Bethurum and Arthur Napier's editions of the homilies.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113 (E); Ker 331, Gneuss 637

E is a Worcester manuscript dating from the third quarter of the eleventh century: along with Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 114 (F), it was copied

University of Minnesota Press, 1999), p. xi, my emphasis.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 56.

¹⁸ Neil Ker, 'The Handwriting of Archbishop Wulfstan', in *England Before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. Peter Clemoes and Kathleen Hughes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 315–31.

by the scribe Wulfgeat for St Wulfstan of Worcester; the two manuscripts were originally a single volume comprising St Wulfstan's homiliary. A table of contents on fol. xi^v indicates that the two volumes originally contained sixty homilies, of which the majority are by Ælfric and Wulfstan. Neil Ker estimates that the volume was divided into two manuscripts no later than the early thirteenth century, when a second table of contents was added into the margins of F.¹⁹ Today, Wulfstan's homilies are concentrated in E and Ælfric's in F. Glosses in the tremulous Worcester hand as well as other contemporary Worcester glosses are found throughout; there are also sixteenth-century notes by Matthew Parker's secretary, John Joscelyn. Wulfstan's death is noted for 28 May on a calendar found on fol. i^v–ii. E contains the archetypes of one recension of the majority of Wulfstan's homilies; hence, where possible, it is the base manuscript for the homilies in both Napier's and Bethurum's editions (the latter with the exception of homily Xc, *Her ongynd be cristendome* and homily XX *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*). Bethurum prints nineteen homilies from E; Napier includes an additional eight texts, of which two – *De initio creature* (Napier 1) and *Be mistlican gelimpan* (Napier 35) – are Wulfstan's.

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201, pp. 1–178 (C),
Ker 49, Gneuss 65/65.5

C dates from the first half of the eleventh century with an uncertain provenance. Helmut Gneuss suggests New Minster, Winchester, while Mildred Budny somewhat more cautiously lists a possible attribution to Winchester, with additions that are 'probably' from New Minster, noting, however, that since the majority of the manuscript's texts are Wulfstanian, 'it must derive from at least one center linked with him'.²⁰ Early scholars had identified the manuscript with Worcester, but this attribution was rejected by Ker.²¹ Bethurum accepted Ker's assessment, but noted that although the manuscript bears 'none of the unmistakable Worcester marks, the contents of the volume' – no doubt its preponderance of works associated with Wulfstan – 'indicate . . . some connexion with Worcester or with York'.²² Which center the manuscript originated in is still a matter of some controversy.²³

¹⁹ Ker, item 331, p. 391.

²⁰ Mildred Budny, *Insular, Anglo-Saxon, and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge: An Illustrated Catalogue* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1997), vol. I, p. 477.

²¹ For early attributions, see Joseph Wanley in George Hickes, *Linguarum veterum septentrionalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archaeologicus* (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1705), vol. II, p. 141; Emil Feiler, 'Das Benediktiner-Offizium', *Anglistische Forschungen* 4 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1901), p. 8; and C. H. Turner, *Early Worcester Manuscripts* (Oxford, 1916). C is not listed as a Worcester volume in Ker's *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* (London: Offices of the Royal Society, 1941).

²² Bethurum, p. 2.

²³ See, for example, Graham D. Caie, ed. and trans., *The Old English Poem 'Judgment Day II': A Critical Edition with Editions of 'De dii iudicii' and the Hatton 113 Homily 'Be domes dæge'* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000), pp. 7–10, for Worcester; and Wormald, *Making of English Law*, p. 208, for York.

Budny calls the volume a 'handbook for both ecclesiastical and secular life', and echoes Mary Richards's earlier assessment of the manuscript as a teaching text²⁴ by suggesting that its intended usage may have been 'training ecclesiastics destined for high office'.²⁵ With E, C is a major source of Wulfstan's homilies: Bethurum prints or collates twenty sermons from C, Napier twenty-eight, of which seven are Wulfstan's in whole or in part: Napier 1 (unrubricated), Napier 23–4 (*To folce*), Napier 25 and 27 (each rubricated *To eallum folce*), Napier 35 (*Be mislicum gelimpum*), and Napier 38 (*Her is git oper wel god eaca*). Although the C scribes are often somewhat careless in copying, the manuscript preserves important unique readings and sometimes entire texts that are lacking in the other manuscripts. In addition to the homilies, C contains the Old English Benedictine Office, parts of Wulfstan's *Institutes of Polity*, Ælfric's first Old English letter to Wulfstan, the *Canons of Edgar*, *Apolonius of Tyre*, and a variety of legal codes, including the Northumbrian Priests' Law, I Æthelstan, I Edmund, II and III Edgar, V, VI, VIIa, and VIII Æthelred, parts of I and II Cnut, *Gepyncðo*, *Norðleoda laga*, *Mircna laga*, *Að*, and *Hadbot*.

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 419 (B); Ker 68, Gneuss 108

B is a companion manuscript to Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 421 (A); both manuscripts date from the first half of the eleventh century, with an Exeter provenance and a probable origin in the southeast, possibly Canterbury. The manuscripts were bequeathed to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, by Matthew Parker, who added a table of contents (p. viii) and a frontispiece of Christ's entry into Jerusalem dating to the thirteenth century. B contains fifteen homilies, of which eleven were printed or collated by Napier as Wulfstan's, and six by Bethurum. The homilies comprise the archetypes of a different recension from that found in E. The extant Wulfstan texts are (according to the rubrics in the manuscript) *Sermo de baptisate* (Bethurum VIIIc; Napier 5), *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi* (Bethurum VI; Napier 2), *De fide catholica* (Bethurum VII; Napier 3), *Her ongynd be cristendome* (Bethurum Xc; Napier 10), *Larspell* (Bethurum XIII; Napier 21–2), *Lar Spell* (Bethurum XX; Napier 33, i.e., *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*), and *Larspel and scriftboc* (Napier 47).

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 421 (A); Ker 69, Gneuss 109

A is a companion volume to B; the majority of the manuscript is written in the same hand as B. It has a contemporary frontispiece depicting the crucifixion and a Parkerian table of contents. The manuscript contains fifteen homilies, although the last text, *In ascensione domini*, is incomplete; a sixteenth homily, *De duodecim abusiuus*, is listed in Parker's table of contents on p. vii. Ten of the fifteen homilies are Ælfric's; the other five were printed or collated by

²⁴ Mary P. Richards, 'The Manuscript Contexts of the Old English Laws: Tradition and Innovation', in *Studies in Earlier English Prose*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: SUNY Press, 1986), pp. 171–92.

²⁵ Budny, *Insular Anglo-Saxon and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art*, vol. I, pp. 475, 477.

Napier as Wulfstan's, although Bethurum accepts only one (Bethurum III; Napier 15), unrubricated in A but given the title *Secundum Lucam* in E. Napier is right, however, in printing Homily 50, rubricated *Larspell*, as Wulfstan's. Two self-contained 'booklets' written at Exeter have been bound into the manuscript (pp. 3–98 and 209–24),²⁶ the second of these contains both of the Wulfstan homilies.

London, British Library, Cotton Nero A.i (I),
Ker 141, Gneuss 340/341²⁷

I is a small octavo manuscript with a provenance of Worcester or York comprising something of a Wulfstanian miscellany; it contains legal texts, a version of Wulfstan's 'commonplace book', the *Institutes of Polity*, and a selection of homilies. The manuscript is a composite made up of two parts written at differing times, with the later section bound to the front of the earlier. Fols. 3–57 can be dated to the mid-eleventh century; they contain I and II Cnut, II and III Edgar, the capitula to the *Laws of Alfred and Ine*, *Romscot*, and chapter 20 (*Judex*) of Alcuin's *De virtutibus et vitiis*. Added to this is the introductory portion of the *Laws of Alfred and Ine*, which breaks off on fol. 57^v in mid-sentence. In the sixteenth century this portion of the manuscript was in the library of Archbishop Matthew Parker at Cambridge, where John Joscelyn added twelve additional leaves (fols. 58–69) and completed the text of *Alfred and Ine*. The folios were then bound into the present volume; Sir Robert Cotton acquired the composite manuscript in 1603.

The second section, fols. 70–177, dates from the first quarter of the eleventh century and contains annotations in Wulfstan's hand that place it before his death in 1023. This portion of the manuscript is made up of four booklets comprising fols. 70–96, 97–108, 109–21, and 122–77;²⁸ the first three are Old English, the fourth Latin. The English texts include all of the earlier and portions of the later version of the *Institutes of Polity*, along with two short pieces on the duties and behavior of bishops, the first apparently composed for the opening of a synod, the second part of a homily;²⁹ six legal texts, comprising I Æthelstan, V and VIII Æthelred, partial versions of I Edmund and III Edgar, *Grið*, as well as a unique, fragmentary text Liebermann prints as *Norðhymbra*

²⁶ See P. R. Robinson, 'Self-Contained Units in Composite Manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Period', *Anglo-Saxon England* 7 (1978), 231–8, repr. in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Basic Readings*, ed. Mary P. Richards (New York and London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 25–35, at p. 32. Pages 225–6 of the manuscript complete the booklet, but are blank.

²⁷ For a complete description and facsimile of the manuscript, see Henry Loyn, ed., *A Wulfstan Manuscript Containing Institutes, Laws and Homilies: British Museum Cotton Nero A.i*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 17 (Copenhagen: Roskilde and Bagge, 1971).

²⁸ Robinson, 'Self-Contained Units', p. 30, 30n.

²⁹ These are printed as appendices (e) and (l) respectively in Karl Jost, ed., *Die 'Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical': Ein Werk erzbischof Wulfstans von York*, Swiss Studies in English 47 (Bern: Francke, 1959), pp. 210–16, 262–7.

cyricgrið;³⁰ and four homilies: *Her ongynd be cristendome*³¹ (Bethurum Xc; Napier 10), *Be godcundre warnung* (Bethurum XIX; Napier 28), *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* (Bethurum XX; Napier 33), and *Her is gyt rihtlic warnung* (Bethurum XXI; Napier 34). Latin texts include selections from the *Excerptiones Pseudo-Ecgberti* (Wulfstan's canon law collection); two abbreviated sermons of Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Près, one of which, *Sermo de reconciliatione post penitentiam*, is the source of Wulfstan's *Sermo de cena domini* (Bethurum XV; Napier 32); and a set of biblical excerpts, primarily taken from Ezekiel and printed by Bethurum as homily XVIa, comprising the Latin outline for Wulfstan's *Verba Ezechiel prophete de pigris aut timidis vel negligentibus pastoribus* (Bethurum XVIIb; Napier 41). Wulfstan's hand is evident throughout this portion of the manuscript, correcting, annotating, adding his characteristic two-stress phrases, and even writing portions of the texts.³²

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.iii (K),
Ker 186, Gneuss 363

K is a small folio manuscript from the mid-eleventh century written in five distinct hands with a Christ Church, Canterbury provenance. It contains a number of Latin texts with interlinear glosses in Old English, including the Benedictine Rule, the *Regularis concordia* and Ælfric's *Colloquy*. In addition there are prayers, prognostics, and scientific materials; a handbook for a confessor; an *ordo* for the examination of a bishop; one of Ælfric's homilies; Ælfric's third Pastoral Letter; and several short works by Wulfstan: Bethurum homily XIII (Napier 19–22); Napier homilies 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 36, and 51 (each rubricated *To eallum folke* or *To eallum folce*); and Napier homilies 52 and 53 (rubricated *To mæssepreostum* and *To mæssepreostum* respectively). All of the Napier homilies, with the possible exception of 36, are Wulfstan's.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 (H), Ker 310

H is a late manuscript dating from the mid to late twelfth century, most likely originating in a small scriptorium in the West Midlands with ties to Worcester.³³ The manuscript is made up of a number of sections comprising multiple quires and ending with blank space on the last leaf of each final quire. H contains a large number of homilies, including forty-eight by Ælfric, as well as Ælfric's first and second pastoral letters for Wulfstan. Four Wulfstan homilies occur in a single section:³⁴ *Sermo de baptisate* (Bethurum VIIIc; Napier

³⁰ Fritz Liebermann, ed., *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 3 vols. (Halle: Niemeyer, 1903–16), I, p. 473.

³¹ This is Bethurum's title for the homily, taken from the rubric in B. The rubric in I reads simply *Be cristendome*.

³² For specifics, see Ker, 'Handwriting', pp. 321–4.

³³ For a complete description, see Susan Irvine, ed., *Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343*, EETS os 302 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

³⁴ This is section (f) according to Irvine, *Old English Homilies*, pp. xliii–xlvii, and Malcolm Godden, ed., *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series, Text*, EETS ss 5 (London: Oxford

5), *Sermo* [*Lupi ad Anglos*] (Bethurum XX; Napier 33), [*Incipiunt*] *Sermones* [*Lupi episcopi*] (Bethurum VI; Napier 2), and a composite text rubricated *Secundum Marcum* (Bethurum V; Napier 13) but also comprising Wulfstan's English *De Anticristo* (Bethurum Ib; Napier 12, unrubricated) and *De temporibus Anticristi* (Bethurum IV; Napier 12, unrubricated). Owing to its late date, the manuscript contains many Middle English forms; however, despite the purely linguistic updating, Wulfstan's homilies are, in Jonathan Wilcox's words, 'strikingly unrevised from their eleventh-century form'.³⁵ Moreover, as Bethurum points out, H 'retains in many cases authoritative readings not found elsewhere, and sometimes the emendations of the H scribe clarify Wulfstan's sentence structure'.³⁶

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121 (G), Ker 338, Gneuss 644

G is an eleventh-century Worcester manuscript containing canons, penitentials, a confessional, two of Ælfric's pastoral letters and several of his homilies, Wulfstan's *Institutes of Polity*, as well as his homilies *De Anticristo* (Bethurum Ib; Napier 12), *De regula canonicorum* (Bethurum Xa), and *Be godcundre warnung* (Bethurum XIX; Napier 28). The manuscript is signed by the scribe Wulfgeat (fol. 101), and is a possible companion volume to Hatton 113/114. It has glosses as well as a copy of the Nicene Creed (fol. vi) in the tremulous Worcester hand. Interpolated into the *Institutes of Polity* are several short homiletic pieces by Wulfstan.

York, Minster Library, Add. 1 (Y), Ker 402, Gneuss 774³⁷

Even without the presence of Wulfstan's annotations, the beautifully illuminated York Gospels manuscript would have been associated with the archbishop by the Old English additions at the end of the volume. The gospel text itself dates from the end of the tenth or early eleventh century and may have been written at Christ Church, Canterbury;³⁸ however, the manuscript was definitely in York by c.1020, when the first of the additions was appended. The additions comprise ten articles, of which the first seven may be dated c.1020–3: articles 1–3 are surveys of archiepiscopal lands at Sherburn-in-Elmet, Otley, and Ripon; article 4 is a short homily by Wulfstan (Napier 59) rubricated *Sermo Lupi*; articles 5 and 6 are complementary Wulfstan homilies (Napier 60–1) rubricated *Be hæðendome* and *Be cristendome* respectively; and article 7 is a letter from Cnut to the people of England, written from Denmark in the

University Press, 1979), pp. xxxviii, xl.

³⁵ Jonathan Wilcox, 'Wulfstan and the Twelfth Century', in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 83–97, at p. 84.

³⁶ Bethurum, p. 4.

³⁷ For a complete description and facsimile of the manuscript, see Nicholas Barker, ed., *The York Gospels: A Facsimile with Introductory Essays* (London: Roxburghe Club, 1987).

³⁸ Gneuss, p. 115.

winter of 1019–20, which ends with a passage in Wulfstan's style.³⁹ The three remaining additions – an inventory of church treasures at Sherburn-in-Elmet, a series of bidding prayers, and a listing of a certain Ælfric's *fester men*, that is, men who would stand surety for him – all date from the mid to late eleventh century. Wulfstan's corrections come in the homilies and are clearly intended to improve the sense and the style.

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 190 (W),
Ker 45, Gneuss 190

W is a composite manuscript divided into two parts: Part A (pp. iii–xii, 1–294) is a copy of Wulfstan's 'commonplace book' written for the most part in the first quarter of the eleventh century, possibly at Worcester, as it is copied in what David Dumville has characterized as 'almost certainly' a Worcester hand.⁴⁰ Pages 130–1 and 292–4, however, contain additions from the mid-eleventh century in a script identified by Ker as a type used at Exeter.⁴¹ Part B (pp. 295–420) is an Old English manuscript that originates in part from an unidentified location in the mid-eleventh century and in part from Exeter in the second half of the eleventh century; four hands in the Exeter portions are recognizable as belonging to scribes active during and immediately after Leofric's episcopate.⁴² The Latin and English manuscripts were bound together in the eleventh century, and it is possible that the composite volume comprises the *canon on leden 7 scriftboc on englisc* ('canons in Latin and confessional in English') that was given to Exeter by Bishop Leofric sometime before his death in 1072.⁴³ In addition, the 1327 Exeter catalogue listing for a *Penitential uetus et alia plura cum anglico in fine quod sic incipit In principio* ('ancient penitential with many other items, with English at the end and which begins "In principio"') is clearly a description of this manuscript.⁴⁴

Major texts in Part A include the Pseudo-Theodore penitential, a partial version of the first recension of the *Excerptiones Ecgberti*, Ælfric's Latin letters to Wulfstan, three of Alcuin's letters, part of book II of Hrabanus Maurus's *De institutione clericorum*, *De ecclesiastica consuetudine*, excerpts from Amalarius's *Liber officialis*, three abbreviated sermons by Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Près, Adso's *De Antichristo*, and Wulfstan's *Incipit de baptisma* (Bethurum VIIIA; Napier 4). The ordering of the texts differs from the other 'commonplace book'

³⁹ See Simon Keynes, 'The Additions in Old English', in *The York Gospels: A Facsimile with Introductory Essays*, ed. Nicholas Barker (London: Roxburghe Club, 1987), pp. 81–96.

⁴⁰ David Dumville, *English Caroline Script and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism, A.D. 950–1030* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1993), p. 52n. But see Budny, *Insular Anglo-Saxon and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art*, no. 34, vol. I, p. 538, for a caution concerning the confidence with which this attribution can be made.

⁴¹ Ker, item 45, p. 73.

⁴² Budny, *Insular Anglo-Saxon and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art*, no. 34, vol. I, p. 537.

⁴³ Recorded in Exeter, Cathedral Library, 3501 (fol. 1v) in the list of items given by Leofric to the cathedral.

⁴⁴ Ker, item 45, p. 73.

manuscripts and may reflect an early version of the collection.⁴⁵ Part B has three of Ælfric's letters, *ordines* for the Easter and Whitsun vigils, the *Confessionale Pseudo-Ecgberti*, excerpts from the Old English Rule of Chrodegang, the Pseudo-Ecgbert penitential, three law codes (*Mirce*, *Að*, and *Hadbot*), *De ecclesiasticis gradibus*, and three homilies, of which one is by Ælfric.⁴⁶

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 265 (X), Ker 53, Gneuss 73

X is a copy of Wulfstan's 'commonplace book' written in the mid to late eleventh century, most likely at Worcester Cathedral Priory, with a series of additions made at Worcester dating from the late eleventh century up to the sixteenth, along with further additions made when the manuscript was acquired by Matthew Parker.⁴⁷ In Patrick Wormald's words, the manuscript is 'a compendium of canonical, penitential and liturgical texts, amounting to a comprehensive handbook for an active pastor'.⁴⁸ It contains most of the texts extant in W, along with IV Eadgar; additional texts providing excommunication formulae and formulae for the reconciliation of excommunicates; an *ordo* for the consecration of chrism that differs from the text in W; and Abbo's sermon for the reconciliation of penitents on Maundy Thursday, which provides Wulfstan's source for *Sermo de cena domini* (Bethurum XV; Napier 32). Of Wulfstan's homiletic writings, X contains *De baptismo* (Bethurum VIIIa; Napier 4); in addition, there are a series of Latin letters relating to Wulfstan that are printed by Bethurum as her Appendix II.⁴⁹

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 302 (D), Ker 56, Gneuss 86⁵⁰

D is an early twelfth-century volume of uncertain provenance, although D. G. Scragg suggests a southeastern origin.⁵¹ D contains Ælfric's *Hexameron*, twenty-six of Ælfric's homilies, six anonymous homilies, and the unique witness of one of Wulfstan's sermons, a Latin homily on baptism, *Dominica IIIa vel quando volueris* (Bethurum VIIIb). The collection is a *temporale* with homilies for Sundays and feast-days (excluding saints' days) from the first Sunday in Advent to Wednesday in Rogationtide; Wulfstan's work is included for the fourth Sunday in Advent or *quando volueris*.

⁴⁵ See Dorothy Bethurum, 'Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book', *PMLA* 57 (1942), 916–29, at p. 928; Wormald, *Making of English Law*, p. 221.

⁴⁶ Gneuss, items 59 and 59.5, p. 33. See also Mary Bateson, 'A Worcester Cathedral Book of Ecclesiastical Collections, Made c.1000 A.D', *English Historical Review* 10 (1895), 712–31, and Christopher A. Jones, 'A Liturgical Miscellany in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 190', *Traditio* 54 (1990), 103–40.

⁴⁷ Budny, *Insular Anglo-Saxon and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art*, no. 40, vol. I, p. 599.

⁴⁸ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, p. 211.

⁴⁹ Bethurum, pp. 374–7.

⁵⁰ For a full manuscript description, see John C. Pope, ed., *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, 2 vols., EETS os 259–60 (London: Oxford University Press, 1967–8), I, pp. 51–2.

⁵¹ D. G. Scragg, 'The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives Before Ælfric', *Anglo-Saxon England* 8 (1979), 223–77, at p. 247.

Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. Kgl. Sam. 1595 (Cop),
Ker 99, Gneuss 814⁵²

Cop is a copy of Wulfstan's 'commonplace book' dating from the first quarter of the eleventh century; Wulfstan's hand is evident in the manuscript adding corrections and headings.⁵³ It contains twenty-four texts divided into seven sections, at least four of which were copied at Worcester,⁵⁴ where the volume was compiled, most likely as a gift for Gerbrand, the newly ordained bishop of Roskild in Denmark.⁵⁵ The manuscript includes two of Wulfstan's Latin homilies: *De Anticristo* (Bethurum Ia) and *Incipit de baptisma* (Bethurum VIIa); in addition, on fol. 66r, Wulfstan has written sixteen lines of homiletic prose, apparently at differing times, since the handwriting shows evidence of additions and corrections.⁵⁶

London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra B.xiii (N),
Ker 144, Gneuss 322

N is a small, quarto composite manuscript. The first part (fols. 1–58), dating from the third quarter of the eleventh century and written at Exeter, is a fragment of a larger volume; Ker suggests London, Lambeth Palace, 489, with which it 'certainly' shares a scriptorium.⁵⁷ This portion of N is made up primarily of Ælfric's homilies, although two of Wulfstan's works, *Lectio secundum Lucam* (Bethurum XVII; Napier 37) and *De dedicatione ecclesiae* (Bethurum XVIII; Napier 54), are included, along with a short passage comprising the ending of Napier 27. The second part of the manuscript (fols. 59–90) dates from the early twelfth century with a possible provenance of St Albans, Canterbury and contains the *Vita sancti Dunstani* by 'B' and a responsory.

London, British Library, Cotton Otho B.x (M),
Ker 177, Gneuss 355

M is a fragmentary manuscript of unknown provenance dating from the early eleventh century; it was badly damaged in the Cotton Library fire of 1731. The remaining leaves contain a series of saints' lives, mostly Ælfric's,

⁵² For a complete description and facsimile of the manuscript, see James E. Cross, and J. Morrish Tunberg, eds., *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection: Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek GL. Kgl. Sam. 1595, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 25* (Copenhagen: Roskilde and Bagge, 1993).

⁵³ Ker, 'Handwriting', pp. 319–21.

⁵⁴ Jennifer Morrish Tunberg, 'Physical Description', in James E. Cross, and J. Morrish Tunberg, eds., *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection: Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek GL. Kgl. Sam. 1595, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 25* (Copenhagen: Roskilde and Bagge, 1993), pp. 24–8, at pp. 28–9.

⁵⁵ John Gerritsen, 'The Copenhagen Wulfstan Manuscript: A Codicological Study', *English Studies* 79 (1998), 501–11.

⁵⁶ Ker, item 99, p. 140.

⁵⁷ Ker, item 283, p. 345.

with homiletic fragments. Folio 23 contains a few lines of Wulfstan's *Sermo de baptisate* (Bethurum VIIIc; Napier 5), and fol. 126 has the beginnings of Wulfstan's Pastoral Letter (Bethurum XIII; Napier 19) and the ending of Napier 22.

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.xiii, fols. 1–118 (L),
Ker 190, Gneuss 366⁵⁸

The first part of L is a Worcester manuscript from the first quarter of the eleventh century containing an early-eleventh-century cartulary and Napier homily 1; this section was bound with Hemming's late-eleventh-century cartulary sometime in or before the fifteenth century.⁵⁹ Wulfstan's hand is evident throughout the first part of the manuscript: in the cartulary proper he adds the name of the estate to which each charter refers in the margin; in the homily, he adds corrections and some of his characteristic phrasing.⁶⁰

London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A.xiv (Vesp),
Ker 204, Gneuss 383⁶¹

Vesp is a small quarto manuscript made up primarily of letters dating from the first quarter of the eleventh century before Wulfstan's death in 1023; the presence of Wulfstan's handwriting gives it a provenance of Worcester or York. It contains a selection of Alcuin's letters among others; a poem addressed to Wulfstan, but written in the archbishop's own hand; the decrees of the Council of Chelsea (816) and of Hertford (672); and the *Constitutiones* of Archbishop Oda.

London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D.ii (V), Gneuss 388

V is a Latin octavo manuscript in a very small hand dating from the early twelfth century.⁶² Gneuss suggests that it was copied in Normandy, but came to England by 1100. It contains penitentials, homilies, canons, saints' lives, Adso's *De Anticristo*, and Wulfstan's Latin *De Anticristo* (Bethurum Ib).

⁵⁸ For a full description of the manuscript see N. R. Ker, 'Hemming's Cartulary', in *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*, ed. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin, and R. W. Southern (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), pp. 49–75.

⁵⁹ Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. 250–1. See T. Hearne, ed., *Chartularium ecclesiae Wigoriensis* (Oxford, 1723).

⁶⁰ Ker, 'Handwriting', pp. 324–6.

⁶¹ For a full discussion of the manuscript see Gareth Mann, 'The Development of Wulfstan's Alcuin Manuscript', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 235–78.

⁶² See J. E. Cross, 'Wulfstan's *De Anticristo* in a Twelfth-Century Worcester Manuscript', *Anglo-Saxon England* 20 (1991), 203–20, at p. 206n.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 37 (Bar)

Bar is a Latin manuscript of the late twelfth century, the last extant copy of Wulfstan's 'commonplace book'. It contains letters written by Wulfstan during his tenure as bishop of London and his Latin homily *Incipit de baptisma* (Bethurum VIIIa).

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 114 (F), Ker 331, Gneuss 638

F is the companion volume to E, written by the Worcester scribe Wulfgeat in the third quarter of the eleventh century as the second half of St Wulfstan's Homiliary. Most of its contents are homilies by Ælfric; there is also part of Wulfstan's *De dedicatione ecclesiae* (Bethurum XXVI; Napier 37) and some Wulfstanian passages in an anonymous homily, *De letania maiore*. Napier printed three additional homilies (40, 42, and 55) as Wulfstan's, but these are not authentic.

London, British Library, Add. 38651, fols. 57–8,
Ker 130, Gneuss 294

The surviving fragment of this manuscript consists of two folios from the early eleventh century, written on thick parchment without pricking or ruling. The bottom of fol. 57^r contains a few homiletic phrases in the Wulfstan hand, but the manuscript is otherwise virtually illegible. Its condition suggests that it once comprised part of the medieval binding of another manuscript, most likely one also contained in the British Library collection: Ker suggests either Cotton Vespasian A.xiv or Cotton Nero A.i, noting that they are the two manuscripts in that collection 'with the closest links to Wulfstan'.⁶³ Because Vespasian A.xiv appears too large, he concludes that Nero A.i is the more likely candidate because, although smaller than Add. 38651, it has been substantially cut down, the binder having sliced through some of Wulfstan's annotations in that manuscript.

Napier's 1886 edition of Wulfstan's homilies prints sixty-two texts; Bethurum's 1951 edition, long the standard text, only twenty-four. Although many of the homilies printed by Napier have been shown to be non-Wulfstanian, a good number of authentic Wulfstan texts were omitted by Bethurum for reasons that modern scholarship would deem spurious at best. The next chapter will reconsider the canon of Wulfstan's homiletic writing in light of the manuscript evidence and contemporary editorial theory and practice.

⁶³ Ker, 'Handwriting', p. 321.

Re-Establishing the Wulfstanian Homiletic Canon

THE MODERN CANON of Wulfstan's homiletic works was established in the 1950s, primarily through the scholarship of Dorothy Bethurum, Dorothy Whitelock, and Karl Jost. In the years following, the canon was generally assumed to comprise only those homilies published in Bethurum's 1957 edition; the additional texts previously printed by Arthur Napier were deemed spurious in terms of authorship or, if authentic, considered to be either variants of Bethurum's texts or simply non-homiletic. In recent years, however, Bethurum's editorial practices have come under increasing criticism as a new generation of scholars has returned to the manuscripts to rediscover familiar works in their material contexts.¹ Such criticism is based less on whatever shortcomings Bethurum may have had as a scholar than in the changes scholarly editing and editorial theory have undergone since the mid-twentieth century;² it may therefore serve as an introduction to the effects of editorial theory on the formation of the Wulfstanian homiletic canon, as well as to the impact contemporary editorial theory is having on the re-establishment of the canon today.

The objections to Bethurum's edition are twofold: the first centers around her practice of combining the evidence of several manuscripts in order to create the 'best' possible text of a given homily; the second concerns the criteria she uses to determine the inclusion of individual homilies in her edition. The purpose of 'best text' editing is to recreate an authorial and thus authoritative text by working backwards from the manuscripts to eliminate scribal 'corruption'; that is, to strip out interpolations, restore omissions, and correct obvious errors in copying, even if, as often happens, the end result is a textual variant extant in no manuscript at all.³ The manuscript works

¹ The movement back to the manuscripts has largely been inspired by the work of Fred Robinson, in particular his 'Old English Literature in its Most Immediate Context', in *Old English Literature in Context*, ed. John D. Niles (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1980), pp. 11–29 and 157–61.

² For discussions of how changes in editorial theory have affected Old English textual scholarship in general see D. G. Scragg and Paul E. Szarmach, eds., *The Editing of Old English: Papers from the 1990 Manchester Conference* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1994).

³ Jonathan Wilcox, 'The Wolf on Shepherds: Wulfstan, Bishops, and the Context of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*', in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (New York: Garland, 2000), pp. 395–418, at pp. 396. Wilcox notes that 'Bethurum omits a large part of her homily IV, runs together two homilies to create her VII, combines XIII from a number of shorter

themselves are then all too often regarded as debased and corrupted variants of the modern editor's recreated text, with the scribe or scribes who created the manuscripts seen as obstructions in the editor's path to the author's intentions and words. In contrast, contemporary editors and scholars speak of textual indeterminacy – the *mouvance* that is characteristic of manuscript culture⁴ – rather than 'corruption', and maintain that traditional editorial practice at best serves only to obscure the *mouvance* attested by the manuscripts and at worst can verge on falsification of the manuscript evidence. In the case of an author like Wulfstan, who re-used and revised his own material repeatedly, the presentation of a single, editorially created 'best' text similarly obscures manuscript evidence of Wulfstan's own processes of composition and revision.

The second objection concerns the three criteria Bethurum used to determine the inclusion of particular texts in her edition.⁵ The first criterion, stated explicitly by Bethurum, is Wulfstan's undoubted authorship; the second and third must be inferred from her discussion of the various Napier homilies that she regards as authentically Wulfstanian, but nonetheless excludes from her edition. These additional criteria appear to be *a.* that the text be what she judges a proper homily, and *b.* that it be a 'finished' text.⁶ All three of her criteria are problematic.

In a recent discussion of editing with regard to Ælfric, Joyce Hill points out that 'modern concepts of authorship . . . are not applicable to the Anglo-Saxon period, *even when they appear to be present*'.⁷ Most often, of course, they are not present. The majority of Anglo-Saxon homiletic manuscripts give no indication of authorship at all, identifying homilies through rubrics indicating the particular date in the liturgical calendar for which they are appropriate or, in the case of sermons written for no specific occasion, by such all-purpose rubrics as *Item* ('item'), *Sermo* ('sermon'), or *Larspell* ('homily'). Where indications of authorship do appear, as in the rubric *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi*, 'Here begin the sermons of Bishop Wolf', found in three of the four manuscripts containing Bethurum homily VI (Napier 2), it is difficult if not impossible to determine which homilies beyond the immediate one the

distinct items in the manuscripts, and misses out an alternative ending of XVII' (p. 414n). On Bethurum's editing of Homily IV in particular, see Joyce Tally Lionarons, 'Textual Appropriation and Scribal (Re)Performance in a Composite Homily: The Case for a New Edition of Wulfstan's *De Temporibus Anticristi*', in *Old English Literature in its Manuscript Context*, ed. Joyce Tally Lionarons (Morgan, WV: University of West Virginia Press, 2004), pp. 67–93. See also Orchard, 'Editing Wulfstan', for a discussion of Bethurum XXI.

⁴ On *mouvance*, see Paul Zumthor, *Essai de poétique médiévale* (Paris: Seuil, 1987).

⁵ These criteria are, of course, somewhat speculative, and are based on my interpretation of the texts included and excluded from the edition; Bethurum nowhere sets out a clear statement of her intentions. The frustration this has occasioned among later Wulfstan scholars is summed up in the late Patrick Wormald's declaration that 'I regret to say . . . that my now not inconsiderable experience of the manuscript materials has yet to give me so much as an inkling of upon what basis it was that she chose what to print and how to print it' ('Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh-Century State Builder', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 6–27, at p. 12).

⁶ Bethurum, pp. 24–43.

⁷ Joyce Hill, 'Ælfric, Authorial Identity, and the Changing Text', *The Editing of Old English*, pp. 177–89, at p. 179, emphasis in the original.

word *sermones* applies to. In addition, Anglo-Saxon authors often incorporated lengthy passages from unnamed sources into new works, while contemporary scribal practice allowed for relatively free correction, revision, and expansion of authorial texts. Moreover, authorship in the Middle Ages had little to do with creativity or originality in the modern sense of the terms. As A. J. Minnis explains, the most important criterion of authorship was the establishment of a work's authority with regard to the writer's subject matter.⁸ Writers gained *auctoritas* (both 'authority' and the distinction of 'authorship') by writing or compiling works that were considered authoritative because they were manifestly true; conversely, works were authoritative if they were written by *auctores*, or authors/authorities. The relationship between author and work in the Middle Ages did not resemble that between a parent and child, as modern metaphors describe it, but was instead circular, merging author with text to create an interdependent identity. Thus in manuscript culture, John Dagenais asserts, 'The *auctor* is his text'.⁹

But of course Wulfstan was more than simply his texts; his authority as a writer stemmed not only from the manifest truth of his writings, but also from his historical position as bishop and archbishop within the Anglo-Saxon church, as well as from the stylistic eloquence of his prose. And in fact, very few of the texts Bethurum believed to be thoroughly inauthentic have been accepted by later scholars as authorial. The problem of authorship within the Wulfstan homiletic canon lies rather in Bethurum's policy of excluding authentic homilies that also contain lengthy portions of texts borrowed from non-Wulfstanian sources and unrevised into Wulfstan's characteristic style (as in Napier homily 1), or of excising such borrowed passages from the homilies she does include in her edition (as in Bethurum homily IV).¹⁰

The Napier texts Bethurum excludes on the basis of genre are far more numerous. But although she includes only those works she considers true homilies, she never defines precisely what she believes a homily to be.¹¹ Her remarks on Napier homily 59, however, are illuminating: 'I exclude from this edition 59, though it is entitled in the York Gospels *Sermo Lupi* and though it has a homiletic beginning and end. It is, nevertheless, only a combination of passages from Polity and the laws . . . Repetitive as the archbishop was in some of his late sermons, he never composed a *homily* in this way.'¹² Here it would appear that Bethurum's definition is based on content and method of composition rather than on formal structure, for Napier 59 is clearly structured (and rubricated) as a homily. An important addition to these comments can be found in Bethurum's acknowledgment with regard to Napier 51 that 'the interrelation between sermons and law codes in the early eleventh century

⁸ A. J. Minnis, *The Medieval Theory of Authorship* (London: Scolar Press, 1984).

⁹ John Dagenais, *The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture: Glossing the 'Libro de Buen Amor'* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 177.

¹⁰ Interestingly, Bethurum is not concerned with unrevised borrowing in the Latin homilies; presumably this stems from her view that the Latin texts were often outlines or notes for the vernacular sermons.

¹¹ Bethurum never differentiates between 'homily' and 'sermon', using the terms interchangeably.

¹² Bethurum, p. 38; emphasis in original.

makes it difficult to draw the line between them'; nonetheless, she adds, 'we must try to make some distinction'.¹³ Bethurum makes that distinction in her edition by excluding not only Wulfstan's law codes *per se* and items rubricated as chapters of the *Institutes of Polity*, but also any text, whether structured formally as a homily or not, in which the majority of the content is either based on or borrowed from the laws or *Polity*. In addition, if a discrete section of a larger homily has such content, Bethurum truncates the text by omitting the offending section. But Wulfstan himself made little if any distinction between the two types of writing; thus Bethurum's absolute differentiation between the two, based on thoroughly twentieth-century ideas of genre, cannot fairly be applied to the eleventh century, especially when the manuscript context of a text indicates that it was regarded by the scribe and thus presumably by its Anglo-Saxon readers as a homily or as part of a longer homiletic work.

Both the method of composition and the state of completion of a homily are also important to Bethurum, although in practice the two categories often overlap. With regard to Napier homilies 60 and 61, Bethurum writes that both texts, 'like [Napier homily] 50 are made up of combinations of Wulfstan's phrases so astutely put together as to make unlikely the probability that anyone else was responsible for them'.¹⁴ To Bethurum, such combining of previously used phrases means that 'These two pieces can hardly be said to have been "composed", and [thus] the question of authorship is not very important'.¹⁵ Recent work by Andy Orchard, however, has demonstrated that Wulfstan's characteristic mode of composition was in large part formulaic, based in the incremental repetition and variation of two-stress phrases.¹⁶ In Bethurum homily XXI, rubricated in I and E as *Her is gyt rihtlic warnung 7 soðlic mynung deode to ðearfe*,¹⁷ Orchard calculates that over two-thirds of the phrasing 'can be matched elsewhere in a range of texts either composed by or closely associated with Wulfstan'.¹⁸ Although in Napier 60 and 61 such repetition extends beyond two-stress phrases into full sentences and passages, the basic method of composition remains the same. Homilies made up of combinations of Wulfstan's phrases – especially when the combining was demonstratively or even probably done by Wulfstan himself – cannot therefore be excluded from the canon.

Finally, there is the question of whether or not individual homilies may be considered 'finished'. Bethurum does not eliminate any of Wulfstan's work solely on the basis of its presumed state of completion; rather, she uses the

¹³ Ibid., p. 27.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 39.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 39.

¹⁶ In addition to 'On Editing Wulfstan', see Andy Orchard, 'Crying Wolf: Oral Style and the *Sermones Lupi*', *Anglo-Saxon England* 21 (1992), 239–64; and Andy Orchard, 'Oral Tradition', in *Approaches to Reading Old English Texts*, ed. Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 101–23. On two-stress rhythms in Wulfstan's prose, see Angus McIntosh, 'Wulfstan's Prose', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 35 (1949), 109–42.

¹⁷ I adds the words *gyrne se þe wille* after *ðearfe*. The text is also extant in C, where it is copied twice, rubricated in the first instance as *To eallum folce* and in the second as *Sermo Lupi*.

¹⁸ Orchard, 'Editing Wulfstan', p. 321.

judgment of 'unfinished' as a secondary justification for the exclusion of works already deemed unacceptable on generic or compositional grounds. Thus, she considers Napier 50 as unfinished owing to Wulfstan's failure to revise quotations from Ælfric's letters within the text, although her primary basis for its exclusion is generic and compositional.¹⁹ Likewise Bethurum excludes Napier homilies 23 and 24, both clearly Wulfstan's work, on the twin grounds that they are 'not homilies, nor are they connected in any significant way with Wulfstan's finished sermons'.²⁰

The result of Bethurum's application of her editorial principles to Wulfstan's writings is fourfold: first, individual homilies that may be important for later scholarship are excluded; second, the textual identity of many homilies is corrupted; third, an important characteristic of Wulfstan's homiletic writing – that is, his use of legal and political writing in a homiletic context – is obscured; and fourth, manuscript evidence of Wulfstan's processes of composition is erased. Modern readers wishing to read all of Wulfstan's homiletic works must therefore turn either to the unedited manuscripts themselves or to Napier's edition, in which Wulfstanian and non-Wulfstanian texts are intermingled, and in which individual portions of larger homilies are sometimes printed as separate, and not necessarily consecutive, texts.

In a 1992 article on the dissemination of Wulfstan's homilies – an article concerned primarily with composite sermons written by others but using portions of Wulfstanian material – Jonathan Wilcox provides a list of texts that he feels should be included the canon of Wulfstan's homiletic writing. In addition to the homilies printed by Bethurum, Wilcox's list comprises those texts 'edited by Napier as his homilies I (in MSS CL), XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVII, XXXV, XXXVI (?), XXXVIII (?), L, LI, LII, LIII, LIX, LX, LXI, along with the Copenhagen fragment, the traces in BL. Add. MS 38651, ff. 57–8, and a number of the pieces edited by Jost in the appendices to his edition of *Polity*, namely appendices a, b, c, e, k (?).'²¹ To these should now be added eleven Latin homilies that have been at least tentatively identified as Wulfstan's by J. E. Cross and Thomas N. Hall.²² But although Wilcox's list is substantially correct, because his article is otherwise concerned with the uses of Wulfstan's texts by later compilers, he has not explained all of his choices fully, nor has he elaborated on the relationships of the various Napier homilies and homiletic fragments to each other or to the homilies printed in Bethurum's edition. Those relationships bear closer study.

¹⁹ Bethurum, pp. 39–41.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 36.

²¹ Jonathan Wilcox, 'The Dissemination of Wulfstan's Homilies: The Wulfstan Tradition in Eleventh-Century Vernacular Preaching', in *England in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Carola Hicks (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1992), pp. 199–217, at pp. 200–1.

²² The texts are edited and translated by Thomas N. Hall in 'Wulfstan's Latin Sermons', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 93–139; see also J. E. Cross, 'A Newly Identified Manuscript of Wulfstan's "Commonplace Book": Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale 1382 (U. 109), fols. 173r–198v', *Journal of Medieval Latin* 2 (1992), 63–83; and 'Contents of the Manuscript', in James E. Cross, and J. Morrish Tunberg, eds., *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection: Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek GL. Kgl. Sam. 1595, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile* 25 (Copenhagen: Roskilde and Bagger, 1993), pp. 14–23.

In what follows I have used the terms 'homily' and 'sermon' interchangeably: although it is common critical practice to refer to Wulfstan's works as homilies, they are in fact sermons; that is, even where Wulfstan begins a sermon with a quotation from scripture, he does not proceed to explicate that text phrase by phrase in any systematic fashion as is required to fit the traditional definition of a homily, but rather uses it to establish a thematic basis for his sermon.²³ Beverly Mayne Kienzle defines a sermon as 'an oral discourse, spoken in the voice of a preacher who addresses an audience to instruct and exhort them on a topic concerned with faith and morals and based on a sacred text';²⁴ and although many of Wulfstan's sermons are not based explicitly on a sacred text, Kienzle's definition may serve to distinguish Wulfstan's homiletic writing from his law codes and other writings. I have considered 'homiletic' and thus part of the homiletic canon works that are fragmentary or unfinished if they show signs of orality, are didactic and/or paranetic, and are not clearly part of a legal code or the *Institutes of Polity*.

The Napier Homilies

Napier 1

Napier homily 1, rubricated *De initio creature* in E, is comprised in large part of a translation of book 4, chapter 1 of Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*, in which Gregory compares human life outside paradise to the life of a boy raised in a prison. As Paul Szarmach points out, the translator has endeavored 'to dramatize and to particularize'²⁵ the allegory by adding details not found in Gregory: as a young man of twenty, the prisoner doubts the very existence of the characteristics of the outside world described to him by his mother – the sun, moon, and stars; the fields, streams, and hills; the birds, fish, and other animals – because he has never seen them with his own eyes. In the same way human beings doubt the existence of God and paradise because, unlike Adam, they have not seen these things with their eyes. Scholars agree that the translation was not made by Wulfstan;²⁶ however, Wilcox points out that the homiletic ending to the translation found in C and L is clearly Wulfstan's, owing to a number of corrections to the text – in both the translation and the conclusion – that were made in Wulfstan's hand in L.²⁷ This ending is made up of Wulfstan's translation of a few sentences of chapter 6 of the *Dialogues*, as well as an additional passage – not found in the rest of Wulfstan's work –

²³ J. E. Cross, 'Vernacular Sermons in Old English', in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), pp. 561–96, at p. 572.

²⁴ 'Introduction', in Kienzle, *The Sermon*, pp. 143–74, at p. 151.

²⁵ Paul E. Szarmach, 'Another Old English Translation of Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*?', *English Studies* 62 (1981), 97–109, at p. 108.

²⁶ See Bethurum, pp. 41–2; Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, p. 187; McIntosh, 'Wulfstan's Prose', p. 34n; and David Yerkes, 'The Place of Composition of the Opening of Napier Homily I', *Neophilologus* 60 (1976), 452–4.

²⁷ Wilcox, 'Dissemination', p. 205.

containing reassurances that those who follow God's commandments will receive their reward. Clearly Wulfstan intended the translation to be part of his larger homily, despite the fact that he did not revise the translated text into his own rhetorical style. A second version of Napier 1, found only in E, is made up of the same translation from chapter 1 of the *Dialogues* and an entirely different, albeit Wulfstanian, conclusion, this time copied verbatim from Napier homily 25. But as Wilcox notes, the ending in E 'is only generally relevant as a homiletic conclusion to Napier I and by no means as relevant as the conclusion in C and L. There is nothing to indicate that Wulfstan himself substituted this ending.'²⁸

The recognition that the first version of Napier 1 is indeed Wulfstan's has an important implication beyond the addition of a single text to the canon. Although the evidence of several other homilies indicates that it was Wulfstan's general habit to revise translations from other sources to accord with his rhetorical style, Wulfstan's corrections to Napier 1 establish clearly that the mere fact that a portion – even a substantial portion – of a homily is not Wulfstan's own work does not automatically mean that the homily as a whole is non-authorial, nor does it mean that the unrevised borrowing is always to be considered a scribal interpolation.

Napier 23–5

Napier homilies 23–5 are indisputably Wulfstan's work; they pose questions of genre and quality rather than authorship. Bethurum omits Napier 23 and 24 from her edition because each is made up in large part of excerpts from the laws of Cnut and therefore neither text meets her criteria for a proper homily. Moreover, despite her belief that the two texts are 'connected with the Pastoral Letter' (Bethurum XIII, *Sermo ad populum*) because 'They make particular the general admonitions to virtue in that homily, and they have the authority of being associated with it in [the manuscripts]',²⁹ she nonetheless concludes that neither is 'connected in any significant way with Wulfstan's finished sermons'.³⁰ Napier 25 she dismisses as 'a short, poorly composed recapitulation on baptism'³¹ – making it the only text excluded from the edition on the grounds of its quality.

The evidence of the manuscripts, however, indicates that all three texts are in fact connected quite significantly with the Pastoral Letter: Napier 23 occurs as an integral part of the letter in two of its manuscripts (B and C); Napier 24 in three (B, C, and E). Napier 25 comprises part of the letter in C and E.³² In addition, all three homilies are associated with the letter in K.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 205.

²⁹ Bethurum, p. 36.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 36.

³¹ Ibid., p. 36.

³² For details of the manuscript transmission, see Joyce Tally Lionarons, 'Textual Identity, Homiletic Reception, and Wulfstan's *Sermo ad Populum*', *Review of English Studies* 55 (2004), 157–82.

Napier 27

Napier homily 27 is extant in C and K; it is a condensation of the version of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* that is also found in full in C. Its ending appears as an acephalous fragment on fol. 58^r of N, and passages from the homily are used in Napier 50. The text is omitted from Bethurum's edition as non-homiletic; she characterizes it instead as 'a short collection of sentences' from the *Sermo Lupi*.³³ Although Bethurum does not comment on whether or not she believes Wulfstan himself made the condensation, Wilcox points out that the fact that Wulfstan uses this homily rather than one of the full versions of the *Sermo Lupi* as a source for Napier 50 is evidence for his authorship, adding that 'Such homiletic works give an insight into Wulfstan's process of composition and his own attitude towards his works'.³⁴ It should also be noted that despite its relative brevity, Napier 27 is structured much as Wulfstan's other homilies, beginning *Eala leofan men* (Napier 128/3, 'Oh beloved people') and ending with an exhortation to turn away from sin and towards God, so that *he us gefilste þurh his mildheortnesse, swa his willa sy, amen* (Napier 130/8–9, 'he may fulfill us through his mercy, as his will may be, amen').

Napier 35 and 36

Napier 35 and 36 are based on the so-called 'penitential edict', written by Wulfstan and issued by Æthelred from Bath in 1009; the edict is extant today only in the Latin *Quadripartitus* (printed by Liebermann as VII Æthelred³⁵), although a partial translation made by Wulfstan exists in Napier homily 39, *Dis man gerædde, ða se micela here com to lande* (Napier 189/18–19, 'This was decreed when the great army came to the land'), extant only in C. Whereas the edict imposes a three-day fast on the nation specifically in order to avert the Danish invasions, Napier 35 and 36 recommend such a fast as a general rule in the face of any great danger to the populace.³⁶ Bethurum concedes that Wulfstan 'may have written' Napier 35 and 36, although she professes doubts about 36 in particular on the grounds of non-Wulfstanian vocabulary, usage, and style. She excludes both homilies from her edition.

The most extensive discussion of these texts remains that of Karl Jost, who demonstrates that Napier 35 and 36 derive from Napier 39, Wulfstan's Old English translation, rather than from the edict proper, although he believes that both homilies were revised by later hands.³⁷ Napier 35, found in C and E, is clearly written in Wulfstan's style, and Wilcox accepts it without reservation into the canon. Napier 36, found only in K, is based on 35; however, as both

³³ Bethurum, p. 38.

³⁴ Wilcox, 'Dissemination', p. 204.

³⁵ Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, pp. 260–1.

³⁶ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, pp. 331–2, points out that the Napier homilies progressively generalize the text of the edict, Napier 39 divorcing it from ruler and place, Napier 35 and 36 from specific occasion.

³⁷ Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, p. 214. See also the shorter discussion of these texts in Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, pp. 1–2.

Bethurum and Jost point out, it also contains a number of usages foreign to Wulfstan's style, and Wilcox's '?' expresses his doubts concerning the text as well. Perhaps the most striking instance of non-Wulfstanian usage in the homily is the locution *ah hi dydon, swa heom to donne wæs* (Napier 173/4, 'but they did as it was for them to do'), where Wulfstan would surely have written *swa heom þearf wæs*, 'as was necessary for them'³⁸ – the phrase that occurs at the same juncture in Napier 35. Jost observes in addition that the words *gilt*, *rihtlæcan*, and *ancsumnesse* are not characteristically Wulfstanian.³⁹ Moreover, Napier 36 concludes with an *exemplum*, not found in Napier 35, concerning Saul's son Jonathan, who unwittingly broke a fast ordered by his father with a single drop of honey and thus according to the homilist condemned the Israelites to defeat at the hands of the Philistines along with the slaughter of many thousands of men. The *exemplum* misrepresents the biblical story (1 Samuel 14: 24–43 and 31), in which the Israelites are not in fact defeated as a result of Jonathan's actions, nor are thousands killed. Wulfstan uses very few *exempla* in his homilies, and it is unlikely that he would make such an error; moreover, Bethurum points out quite rightly that 'the rhythm of the latter part is not quite like his usual cadence'.⁴⁰

In all, the text of Napier 36 reads as if it had been written from memory by someone who remembered most of the content and some, albeit not all, of the words of Napier 35, and who filled out his text with an extra example. A comparison of the first sentence of each homily reveals variants typical throughout the homily: Napier 35 (169/15–170/3) reads

Gyf hit geweorðe, þæt on þeodscype becume healic ungelimp for manna gewyrhtan, here oððon hunger, bryne oððon blodgyte, unwæstm oððon unweder, orfcwealm oþðon mancwealm þurh færllice uncoða, þonne sece man þa bote aa to gode sylfum

If it happens that in the nation there occur terrible events because of people's deeds, war or hunger, burning or bloodshed, barrenness or storms, cattle-plagues or human plagues through sudden diseases, then the remedy must always be sought from God himself.

In contrast, Napier 36 (172/16–20) has

Gif hit gewyrþe, þæt on þeodscipe becume healic ongelimp for manna gewyrhtan, here oþþe huncger, manncwealm oððe orfcwealm, bryne oþþe blodgyte oþþe ungelimplice gewyderu oþþe færllice coþa oþþe færllice deaþ, þonne sece man a þa bote to gode sylfum

If it happens, that in the nation there occur terrible events because of people's deeds, war or hunger, human plagues or cattle-plagues, burning or bloodshed or bad weather or sudden disease or sudden death, then the remedy must always be sought from God himself.

The initial sentence from Napier 36 differs from that in 35 both in the order

³⁸ The example is found in Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, p. 216.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

⁴⁰ Bethurum, p. 38.

of the alliterating pairs and in the substitution of equivalent phrases for individual words, in one case breaking the rhythm of the passage and in another creating an entirely new alliterative collocation – exactly the sort of changes that a scribe writing from memory might make. Although Wilcox is certainly correct in admitting Napier 35 to the Wulfstan homiletic canon, Napier 36, while based on Wulfstan's homily, cannot be considered Wulfstan's work.

Napier 37

Napier 37 is the full text of a sermon concerning the episcopal consecration rite, printed in truncated form by Bethurum as Homily XVII, *Lectio secundum Lucam* and extant in E and N. In E, the text is divided into two sections that are separated in the manuscript by ten folios, with the second part coming first: part 1 is on fols. 93^v–94^v, breaking off abruptly with the words *et reliqua*, apparently as a result of the scribe's realization that he was recopying a prior text, that is, part 2, found on fols. 83^r–84^v. By contrast, N presents a sequential text and adds a lengthy conclusion, not found in E, that draws heavily on the *Institutes of Polity* and *Grið*. In her edition, Bethurum omits N's conclusion, noting that it seems to her 'an ill-considered scribal addition', despite what she concedes is genuinely Wulfstanian phrasing.⁴¹ In fact, the ending is most certainly Wulfstan's, as he used it again in Napier homily 59, a text corrected in his own hand. Wilcox notes that as the homily progresses, Wulfstan skillfully shifts the tenor of the homily from an explanation of the consecration rite in terms of the liturgy to a more general homiletic message addressed not only to bishops but to all of *Godes þeowas* (Napier 179/4, 'God's servants'), as well as *manna gehwylcne* (179/10, 'all people').⁴² The N text thus completes a shift that was already in progress in the earlier part of the homily, and as it is in fact authorial, there seems no reason to omit it from the text of the sermon as a whole.

Napier 38

Napier 38 is a short piece on the necessity for penance and absolution that is unique to C, where it carries the rubric *Her is git oþer wel god eaca* (Napier 189/1, 'Here is yet another very good [warning] in addition'). Bethurum discusses the text as a 'fragment' and describes it as containing some of Wulfstan's phrases, but notes that 'the whole I do not find characteristic of him'.⁴³ Wilcox, although listing Napier 38 with the other works discussed here, marks it with '(?)', apparently to indicate doubt as to its inclusion. Although much of the text seems tantalizingly close to Wulfstan's style, it also contains several usages that are not common to Wulfstan's work: for example, although Wulfstan often employs the phrases *eala leofan men* and *la leofan men*, the shortened

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 351.

⁴² Wilcox, 'The Wolf on Shepherds', pp. 405–6.

⁴³ Bethurum, p. 42.

usage that begins Napier 38, *la leof*, never appears in the attested homilies, although it does occur in the G text of the *Institutes of Polity*. In addition, Wulfstan rarely if ever leaves a Latin word like *absolutionem* untranslated or unexplained, even in homilies addressed specifically to the clergy; that he would do so in a text addressed to the people at large is unlikely. It may be impossible ever to prove Wulfstan's authorship of Napier 38 one way or the other; however, doubt seems in this case well founded.

Napier 47

Napier 47, rubricated *Larspel and scriftboc*, is preserved only in B. Its beginning comprises a severely abridged version of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, followed by a passage from Byrhtferth of Ramsey's *Enchiridion*. Bethurum states that the first half 'seems to be Wulfstan's work',⁴⁴ while Karl Jost suggests that the text is part of a lost homily by Wulfstan.⁴⁵ Wilcox does not include Napier 47 in his 1992 listing of authentic Wulfstan homilies; however, in a 2004 essay on the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, he notes that 'the selections from the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* [in Napier 47] are augmented by original sentences and phrases that bear the hallmarks of Wulfstan's style' and concludes that 'the whole short work has every indication of Wulfstan's own authorship'.⁴⁶ If so, the work is either a fragment of a longer text or an unfinished homily, for it lacks a homiletic conclusion. Its interest lies in Wulfstan's incorporation of Byrhtferth's interpretation of the ideas that Satan would be bound for a thousand years after the harrowing of hell and that the world would last for six thousand years – ideas that Wulfstan seems to have taken literally in his early eschatological homilies, but which are treated symbolically by Byrhtferth. The homily thus sheds light on the development of Wulfstan's eschatological thought between the early homilies and Napier homily 50.

Napier 50

Napier 50 is extant only in A, where it is rubricated *Lar Spell*. Bethurum expresses no doubts as to Wulfstan's authorship of the homily; she excludes it from her edition on generic grounds, noting that 'it does not seem to me to be a sermon'.⁴⁷ She describes the text as 'near to being a condensation' of the *Institutes of Polity* and suggests that 'this collection of material represents Wulfstan's notes, from which he intended to write a polished and well-ordered address, and that lack of time or infirmity prevented his doing so'.⁴⁸ Nonetheless, she adds that the text was probably 'published in the same way Polity was', but declines to say how such publication took place; most likely she imagines the text as

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, pp. 240–1.

⁴⁶ Jonathon Wilcox, 'Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* as Political Performance', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 375–96, at p. 395.

⁴⁷ Bethurum, p. 40.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 41.

circulating, apparently in unfinished form, among secular and ecclesiastical authorities. To a certain extent Bethurum seems to be trying to have it both ways in her commentary: the text is at one and the same time a set of notes for an address – presumably a sermon – that was never preached, and an authorial condensation of one of Wulfstan's works that is not a sermon at all.

Bethurum dates the text to sometime after 1020 on the basis of its quotations from I Cnut;⁴⁹ Wormald places it two to three years earlier, regarding the sermon as associated with Cnut's 1018 Oxford code⁵⁰ and as a possible source for I Cnut.⁵¹ Because the homily is addressed to the king, the bishops, and the noblemen, it was clearly designed to be preached in front of a meeting of the *witan*. An association with the Oxford code thus raises the possibility that the sermon was in fact written to be preached in Oxford at the 1018 meeting, perhaps as a preliminary announcement of the laws that Wulfstan wanted to be enacted.

Napier 51

Napier 51 is also connected with a law-making council, as it begins with an exhortation to enact *god woroldlagan* (Napier 274/7, 'good secular laws'). The homily is found only in K, where it is somewhat incongruously rubricated *To Eallan Folke*.⁵² Once again Bethurum excludes the text on generic grounds rather than authorial, as the text contains excerpts from V Æthelred, II Cnut, and the *Institutes of Polity*. It is nonetheless structured as a homily, beginning with Wulfstan's habitual opening of *Leofan men*, continuing with reminders that secular law must be based in Christian teachings, and ending with a homiletic conclusion: *halig drihten gemildsa us eallan* (Napier 275/12–13, 'may the holy Lord have mercy on us all').

Napier 52 and 53

Napier 52 and 53 are also unique to K, where they are rubricated *To mæsseprostum* and *To mæsspreostum* respectively. As Bethurum points out, both are made up largely of sentences from the *Institutes of Polity*,⁵³ and it is for this reason that she omits the texts from her edition. Of the texts considered thus far, Napier 52 and 53, although homiletic in content and tone, are the most lacking in homiletic structure: neither begins with Wulfstan's characteristic *Leofan men*, and only Napier 53 ends with a concluding formula, *hali drihten gemiltsige us eallen. amen* (Napier 277/7–8, 'May the holy Lord have mercy on us all, amen'). Moreover, because the last sentence of Napier 52 and the first sentence of 53 are consecutive in the *Institutes of Polity*, one is tempted to

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 40.

⁵⁰ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, p. 335.

⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 356–60.

⁵² The rubric no doubt derives from the fact that in K, Napier 51 is placed among the series of homilies/homiletic fragments that had once made up the Pastoral Letter.

⁵³ Bethurum, p. 38.

speculate that the intervening rubric was included in K to correct what the scribe may have seen as a spelling error in the initial rubric. Nonetheless, both the homiletic tone and the manuscript context of the texts would indicate that they should be restored to the Wulfstanian homiletic canon.

Napier 59–61

Napier 59, 60, and 61 are homilies appended to Y, the York Gospels manuscript;⁵⁴ all three texts contain corrections in Wulfstan's hand. They are rubricated *Sermo Lupi*, *Be hæðendome*, and *Be cristendome* respectively, and are followed in the manuscript by a copy of a letter to the people of England written by Cnut, but with passages in Wulfstan's style. All three homilies are excluded from Bethurum's edition, primarily because of their extensive use of Wulfstan's legal writings. However, Bethurum also cites Jost's suggestion that Napier 60 and 61 could be 'notes for a homily or pastoral letter',⁵⁵ indicating that she might consider these texts unfinished as well. Bethurum further comments that Napier 59 'may have been Wulfstan's own summary of statements on Christian duty to which the Witan had given its authority and which the York diocese especially needed to hear',⁵⁶ a suggestion Simon Keynes broadens to include all three texts: 'The care taken by Wulfstan to assemble these texts, to have them written on a specially prepared gathering of leaves which was then placed at the end of the gospel book, and finally to make certain corrections, suggests that he attached particular importance to them: indeed they represent a considered summary of Wulfstan's view on the proper ordering of a Christian society.'⁵⁷ Napier 59 is clearly structured and rubricated as a homily; it consists of exhortations to the clergy and to Christians in general to observe God's laws, with special attention to the laws concerning marriage. Napier 60 and 61 would seem designed to be a contrasting set, and each is introduced by a Latin text. *Be hæðendome* is concerned not only with heathen practices, but also with evil and evil-doers of every kind; *Be cristendome*, however, is comprised primarily of a list of tithes and church dues owed by the faithful and the days on which they are to be paid, ending with the promise that justice will be done with regard to those who do not comply. Given the importance that Keynes suggests Wulfstan gave these three texts, all three should be admitted to the Wulfstanian homiletic canon.

⁵⁴ For a full discussion of these homilies, see Simon Keynes, 'The Additions in Old English', in *The York Gospels: A Facsimile with Introductory Essays*, ed. Nicholas Barker (London: Roxburghe Club, 1987), pp. 81–99.

⁵⁵ Bethurum, p. 39; see Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, p. 266.

⁵⁶ Bethurum, p. 38.

⁵⁷ Keynes, 'Additions', p. 92.

Manuscript Fragments

The Copenhagen Fragment

The Copenhagen fragment occurs on fol. 66^v of Cop and consists of three short paragraphs in the Wulfstan hand. Jost prints the text with some errors in transcription; a corrected version was published by Ker in 1971.⁵⁸ Most likely the fragment comprises notes for a homily, as it is apparently in the process of revision: variations in the ink and the size of the handwriting indicate that different parts of the text were written at different times.⁵⁹ The text is appended to a series of excerpts from Jeremiah, to which the first words of the Old English text refer:⁶⁰ *Se þe þyses lytlan nele andgyt niman. ne truwie ic æt maran þæt he wille gyman swa swa he scolde his agenre þearfe* ('He who does not understand this short [passage], I would no longer trust that he will do as he should for his own needs'). The paragraph continues with an exhortation to love God and take his teachings to heart, ending with what is apparently the beginning of a new sentence: *Ælc man behofað gastlices fostres* ('Each person needs spiritual sustenance'). A *signe de envoi*, apparently added after the second and third paragraphs had been written, directs the reader at this point to a Latin text in the bottom margin: *Non in sola pane uiuit homo sed in omni uerbo quod procedit de ore dei. Beati qui audiunt uerbum dei et custodiunt illud* ('Man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that comes from the mouth of God. Blessed are they who hear the word of God and observe it'). The final sentence of the Latin is in turn marked with a wavy line that may indicate that it was to be removed. The second and third paragraphs were not written at the same time as the first, for both the ink and the handwriting change, although the text is clearly still in the Wulfstan hand. The paragraphs compare a traveler's need to find out directions to his home to the need of all human beings to *oft spyrian. 7 geornlice smeagean* ('often ask and earnestly seek') the way to heaven, concluding that *Se gefærð gesællice þe godcunde lare. oftost gehyreð 7 geornlicost gymeð. Amen* ('He fares blessedly who most often hears divine teachings and most earnestly takes heed of them. Amen').

Wulfstan uses the excerpts from Jeremiah in Bethurum homily XI, *Incipit de visione Isaie prophete quam uidit super Judam et Hierusalem*; however, the Old English passages from the Copenhagen manuscript do not appear in that text. While the fragment certainly could never meet Bethurum's standard for a finished homily, it remains an important part of the homiletic canon, not only as one of the longest extended pieces of Wulfstan's own handwriting, but also as an example of his method of composition.

⁵⁸ Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, pp. 268–9, prints from Holthausen's 1890 edition, which contains the errors corrected by Ker, 'Handwriting', p. 320; cf. Ker, item 99, p. 140.

⁵⁹ See Ker, item 99, p. 140; 'Handwriting', p. 320.

⁶⁰ Ker, item 99, p. 140.

London, British Library, Add. 38651

Folios 57^v–58^r contain writing in the Wulfstan hand, most of it blotted out, and much of the rest illegible. The writing is smaller than in other manuscripts with the same hand, and, as Ker reports, ‘it is not continuous nor all at the same angle’.⁶¹ The manuscript may contain disconnected fragments rather than a single text – in fact, Ker entitles the description of the manuscript in his *Catalogue* simply ‘Scribbles’.⁶² He notes that at the top of fol. 57^v is a Latin quotation from Jeremiah 4: 10, that towards the bottom the phrase *hwæper . . . æper . . . brucan* is legible, and that fol. 58^r includes the typically Wulfstanian phrases *Leofan men [understan]dað geornlice hu . . . towards the top of the page, and forþam don . swa swa us micel þearf is . helpan ure . . . we magan 7 moton . . . áa rihtne geleafan* in the lower right corner. In addition to the phrases noted by Ker, only scattered words and letter forms are legible: one may read on fol. 57^v the ending *-eðon*, the word *riht*, what is possibly the word *deað*, along with a few isolated letters. On fol. 58^r, a clear Tironian *et* follows Ker’s *geleafan*, and is followed by what could be the word *lufian*; in addition, in the middle of the page the forms *þ [nu?] rihtne* and, farther down, *foram* are legible. The pages are badly stained and, as Ker points out, were most likely used at one point to rebind another manuscript; he suggests somewhat tentatively that the manuscript in question may have been either Vesp or I.⁶³

Appendices to the ‘Institutes of Polity’

At the end of his edition of the *Institutes of Polity*, Karl Jost appends eleven short texts found variously interpolated into the manuscripts of the longer work. Appendix D is a version of part of the *Canons of Edgar* and need not be discussed here. Of the ten remaining, one (Appendix H) is definitely not Wulfstan’s, five (A, B, C, E, and K) are accepted by Wilcox as additions to Wulfstan’s homiletic canon, and four (F, G, I, and L) are rejected by Wilcox as non-homiletic.⁶⁴ Each of these requires examination.

Appendix A: *Be godes þeowum*

Appendix A is found on fol. 20^{r-v} of G, where it appears as chapter 16 of the *Institutes of Polity*, following a chapter on widows (*Be wudewan*) and preceding one on priests (*Be sacerdum*). Jost points out that its place within *Polity* is highly doubtful (‘höchst zweifelhaft’) because its style is that of a sermon (‘Predigstil’) rather than a treatise on the order of society.⁶⁵ Like the majority of Wulfstan’s homilies, it begins with *Leofan men*; in addition, Wulfstan twice

⁶¹ Ker, ‘Handwriting’, p. 321.

⁶² Ker, item 130, p. 162.

⁶³ Ker, ‘Handwriting’, p. 321.

⁶⁴ Wilcox, ‘Dissemination’, p. 201n. Note that there is no Appendix J in Jost’s edition.

⁶⁵ Jost, *Polity*, p. 24.

exhorts his audience to listen or hear, indicating that this is a text intended for oral delivery: *ic bidde, gehyrað, hwæt ic wylle secgan . . . hlýstað swyðe georne, hwæt ic secge*⁶⁶ ('I ask you to hear what I will say . . . listen very eagerly to what I say'). Most of the text is made up of phrases and sentences from other works by Wulfstan: sources include Napier 39, Napier 35, the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, and VIII Æthelred. The text lacks a homiletic closing and may be a fragment of a larger sermon.

Appendices B and C: *Ad sacerdotes*

Appendices B and C, each rubricated *Ad sacerdotes*, are found on fols. 23^r–25^v of G, where they constitute chapters 18 and 19 of *Polity*, following chapter 17, *Be sacerdom*, and preceding chapter 20, *Sinodalia decreta*. Jost collates all four texts with Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, Add. 3206, a fragmentary manuscript consisting of two sheets of parchment once used as bookbinding material and written in a mid-eleventh-century hand. Once again the language of the appendices is homiletic and, as the rubrics would indicate, uses a second-person point of view addressed to a listening audience made up of priests. Appendix B, for example, begins with *La Leof, understandeð eow sylfe 7 lufiað 7 weorðiað God ælmihtigne* (Jost, *Polity*, 170, 'Oh Beloved, understand yourself and love and honor almighty God'), and the passage contains a paraphrase of one of Wulfstan's sentences from *Sermo in .XL.* (Bethurum XIV; Napier 17). Moreover, a significant portion of the text is made up of sentences from a penitential work edited by Roger Fowler as 'A Late Old English Handbook for the Use of a Confessor'⁶⁷ that may have been compiled by or for Wulfstan and that contains sections most likely written by him.

Appendix C is unconnected with B except for its rubric and placement within the manuscripts. The text opens abruptly with the injunction to *Tæcad cristenum mannum georne 7 gelome rihtne geleafan* (Jost, *Polity*, 173, 'Teach Christians correct belief eagerly and often'); however, midway through the text a new paragraph begins with *Leofan men, doð, swa ic eow lære* (Jost, *Polity*, 176, 'Beloved people, do as I teach you'). Jost comments that such homiletic language is as far as it could be from 'der kühlen, ursprünglichen Stil' of the *Institutes of Polity*.⁶⁸ He finds no direct quotations or paraphrases from Wulfstan's attested works in the passage, but the text is in Wulfstan's style throughout and there is little doubt of its authorship. Whether it is a homily or part of a pastoral letter is uncertain: the text seems to be addressed to particular priests rather than to priests in general, for Wulfstan states that

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 167; further quotations from *Polity* and its appendices are cited in the text by page number.

⁶⁷ Roger Fowler, ed., 'A Late Old English Handbook for the Use of a Confessor', *Anglia* 83 (1965), 1–34, at pp. 27–8. Jost sources the passage to Benjamin Thorpe, 'Of Penitents', in *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England* (London, 1840), p. 411; however, Thorpe silently conflates portions of the 'Handbook' with passages from the *Canons of Edgar*. For a full discussion of the 'Handbook', see Chapter 6.

⁶⁸ Jost, *Polity*, p. 25; 'the cool, original style'.

those in his audience are in his service whether they be far or near (*swa fyr swa myr swa hwæper*, Jost, *Polity*, 176), and he proposes that they henceforth meet once a year at a chosen time for their common need (*ic huru wille, þæt we heonanforð ælce geare sume siðe us gesomnian togædere ymbe ure gemænan þearfe*, Jost, *Polity*, 176). The conclusion of the text would work equally well for a homily or letter: *God ælmihtig helpe ure 7 sancta Maria 7 gefultumie us eallum, þæt we ægðer ge us sylfe ge þa, þe we wisian sceolan, swa gewisian motan, swa swa ure ealra þearf sy* (Jost, *Polity*, 177, 'May almighty God and Saint Mary help us and support us all, both ourselves and those whom we must instruct as we may, as is needful for us all').

Appendix E: *Incipit de synodo*

Jost's Appendix E is found in G on fols. 15^v–17^r as chapter 8 of *Polity*, in between Wulfstan's discussion of the role of bishops in chapter 7 and that of noblemen in chapter 9; it also occurs in I on fols. 99^r–100^v, where it is both preceded and followed by sections on bishops, albeit with a Latin passage concerning the tonsure and clothing of the clergy interpolated just before *Incipit de synodo*.⁶⁹ The text is structured, as its rubric indicates, as the opening homily of a synod, with a Latin introduction giving the order of the psalms and prayers that would begin the council. Its contents apparently comprise the decisions of that council: the text lists rules for the behavior of bishops, which clearly accounts for its placement at this point in *Polity*.⁷⁰ The language is undoubtedly Wulfstan's throughout.

Appendix F: *Be gehadedum mannum*

Appendix F appears on fols. 34^r–35^v of G as chapter 23 of the *Institutes of Polity*, following the identically named chapter 22 that is a part of *Polity* itself. It is introduced once again by Wulfstan's characteristic homiletic opening, *Leofan men*; however, the first six sentences of the text proper are not Wulfstan's; rather, they comprise a translation of part of Ayto's *Liber de visione et obitu wetini monachi* detailing the punishments awaiting in hell for unchaste priests and their mistresses.⁷¹ Both Jost and Whitelock agree that the style of the translation is Ælfric's, and they speculate that the lines have been taken from a lost Ælfrician work.⁷² The remainder of the text is nevertheless clearly Wulfstan's and is concerned with the education of priests before ordination. Whether Wulfstan added the Ælfrician introduction is impossible to say: Jost posits an 'unbekannter Kompilator',⁷³ although the opening *Leofan men* may indicate that the compiler was in fact Wulfstan himself. If so, most likely the text is either unfinished or has been incompletely revised as a homily, as the

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 11.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 22.

⁷¹ Migne, PL 105, 774A, cited in Jost, *Polity*, p. 217.

⁷² Jost, *Polity*, pp. 26–7; Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, p. 26n.

⁷³ Jost, *Polity*, p. 28, 'an unknown compiler'.

Ælfrician passages are unrevised and the text is lacking not only a homiletic conclusion, but any sort of conclusion at all. As noted above, Wilcox omits the appendix from his list as non-homiletic; Jost speculates that it could be seen as a 'selbständige Verordnung für Priesterkandidaten'.⁷⁴ Given Wulfstan's blurring of generic lines between law and homily, however, exclusion of this text seems unwarranted: with the addition of a homiletic conclusion it could easily have been preached to an audience of priests and bishops.

Appendices G and H: *De ecclesiasticis gradibus*

Appendices G and H appear as a single text on fols. 35^v–42^r of G, where together they comprise chapter 24 of *Polity*, directly following Appendix F, with which Appendix G is thematically connected. Because the text clearly divides into two unequal parts, combined by an abrupt and awkward transition, Jost lists each part as a separate appendix. Appendix G, the first and longest portion of the text, is also extant as a self-contained work in C and W.⁷⁵ As its rubric would indicate, it comprises an explanation of the seven clerical orders, with special attention paid to the symbolic example set by Christ for all seven. Jost identifies several sources utilized in the work, primarily Theodulf's *Capitula* and the Pseudo-Egberti *Pontificale*, but also Wulfstan's *Sermo de baptisate* (Bethurum VIIIc; Napier 5). This first part of the text is largely in Wulfstan's style: Jost and Whitelock both suggest that its small stylistic discrepancies may stem from Wulfstan's incomplete revision of an earlier work by an unknown author.⁷⁶

The second part of the text, Jost's Appendix H, also appears in C and W, but as the end of Napier homily 46 rather than in connection with *De ecclesiasticis gradibus*. It was clearly not written by Wulfstan⁷⁷ and is better suited as an ending for Napier 46 than for *De ecclesiasticis gradibus* both stylistically and thematically. There is no reason to believe that Wulfstan added this text as the ending of Napier 46, and, given the manuscript evidence found in C and W, Jost is most likely correct in regarding Appendix G as a separate work.

Wilcox, while agreeing that Appendix G is Wulfstan's work, rejects the text as non-homiletic, and certainly as it stands the work is not structured as a finished homily. It is, however, homiletic in style and tone: the explanation of each grade of the priesthood is followed by an undoubtedly homiletic passage addressed to an audience of priests comprising a series of sentences beginning with *uton* ('let us') and exhorting the audience to do what is necessary to be worthy of their office. The passage ends with a prayer that could easily serve as the ending to a homily, to which the C scribe added an 'amen': *Se*⁷⁸ *God*,

⁷⁴ Ibid., 'an independent ordinance for candidates for the priesthood'.

⁷⁵ C, pp. 108–12; W, pp. 314–19. In C the text ends with the word 'Amen' 28 sentences short of its conclusion in G; in W it breaks off mid-sentence at the same point that the C text ends.

⁷⁶ Jost, *Polity*, p. 30. His suggestion is echoed by Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, pp. 26–7.

⁷⁷ Jost states categorically that 'Wulfstan hatte sicherlich mit diesem zweiten Teil nichts zu tun', *Polity*, p. 31. 'Wulfstan certainly had nothing to do with these two sections'.

⁷⁸ Jost prints '*Pe* (sic!)' from G; however, both C and W read *Se*. See *Polity*, p. 241.

þe ealle ðing don mæg and ealra þinga geweald ah, helpe ure and gefylste us, þæt we magon and motan his willan gewyrcean (Jost, *Polity*, 241, 'May the God who can do all things and who has the governance of all things help and support us, that we can and may work his will'). With Appendix F, I would add the first part of Appendix G to Wulfstan's homiletic canon.

Appendix I: *De regula canonicorum*

Appendix I is extant in G on fols. 55^v–57^v, where it comprises chapter 34 of *Polity*, following excerpts from the Benedictine Office and preceding *Be cyrican*. The text is made up of Wulfstan's translation of chapter 45 of Amalarius of Metz's *De regula canonicorum* and is printed by Bethurum as homily Xa;⁷⁹ it may thus be regarded as already constituting part of the Wulfstanian homiletic canon. Wilcox, however, rejects the text as non-homiletic, and in doing so he is correct in that the text is neither structured as a homily nor addressed to a listening audience. Bethurum's reasoning in including the work in her editions seems primarily to be that it forms a coherent grouping with Wulfstan's Latin homily *De cristianitate* (Bethurum Xb; Napier 9) and its Old English counterpart *Her ongynd be cristendome* (Bethurum Xc; Napier 10), as all three are concerned with 'the Christian life'.⁸⁰ She notes in addition that Wulfstan's 'early method of translation is well illustrated' in the text, and that 'it furnished him with phrases and ideas which he later used several times'.⁸¹

Appendix K: *Be sacerdan*

Appendix K is extant only in C, pages 130–1, where it follows part of the *Benedictine Office* in Latin and precedes *Apollonius of Tyre*. Jost describes it as a supplement to the chapter of *Polity* concerning priests, noting that Thorpe errs in calling the text a variant of *Grið*,⁸² although *Grið* is one of its primary sources, along with *Geðyncðo* and II Cnut. The writing is undoubtedly Wulfstan's; the question is whether or not Wulfstan himself made the compilation. Wilcox marks it as questionable, and barring the discovery of a second manuscript witness, it must remain so.

Appendix L: 'Ermahnung an die Bischöfe'

This text appears on fol. 100^v of I as an unrubricated appendage to *Incipit de synodo*, Jost's Appendix E.⁸³ It is a series of admonitions addressed to bishops, detailing their various shortcomings. That the speaker is himself a bishop is indicated by the repeated use of the pronoun *we*; that the speaker

⁷⁹ Bethurum, pp. 192–3; it is not in Napier.

⁸⁰ Bethurum, p. 31.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 322.

⁸² Jost, *Polity*, p. 9, 9n.

⁸³ Jost (*ibid.*, p. 262n) notes that the text is the 'ungedruckte Klage über die Unsitten der Bischöfe' that Liebermann discusses in *Gesetze*, I, p. 25.

is Wulfstan may be inferred not only from the style but also from the content and tone: in Jost's words, 'Kein anderer als Wulfstan hätte den Bischöfen mit solcher Rückhaltlosigkeit ins Gewissen reden können'.⁸⁴ The text has neither a homiletic opening nor conclusion, yet its tone is homiletic throughout; it may therefore be a fragment of a larger homily, and should be considered part of the homiletic canon.

Conclusions

The tentative addition of eleven additional Latin homilies to the Wulfstan canon by Cross and Hall, if accepted, will bring the attention of Wulfstan scholars to a substantial body of work that has been hitherto largely neglected. In addition, the Latin homilies will require us to revise our ideas concerning Wulfstan's use of his Latin texts: rather than assuming that they were written merely as outlines for the Old English homilies, we must envisage the archbishop preaching in Latin as well as in the vernacular, albeit undoubtedly to different audiences. The arguments for the inclusion of these homilies are set out fully by Cross and Hall and need not be rehearsed here.

Of the texts on Wilcox's list, I would remove without reservation only Napier 36, a homily he marks as doubtful; I share his doubts concerning Napier 38 and Jost's Appendix K; and I would add Napier homily 47 and Jost's Appendices F, G, and L as well as retaining Appendix I. But as I hope this chapter has shown, any re-evaluation of the Wulfstanian texts found in the manuscripts with an eye towards re-establishing the canon of Wulfstan's homiletic works must take into account not only the question of authorship, but also questions of genre and textual identity. Read in its entirety, the Wulfstanian homiletic canon has a great deal to teach about textual transmission in Anglo-Saxon England, about the methods one homilist – and thus perhaps others – used in composition, and of course, about Wulfstan himself.

⁸⁴ Jost, *Polity*, p. 23. 'No one other than Wulfstan could have advised the bishops about their consciences with such frankness'.

Wulfstan's Eschatology

DURING HIS TENURE as bishop of London, Wulfstan wrote five homilies devoted wholly to the subject of the Final Days, one in Latin and four in Old English. A sixth, *Secundum Marcum*, may be dated internally as coming not long after the year 1000 and was probably written soon after Wulfstan became archbishop of York in 1002. The end of the world is a subject he returns to repeatedly throughout his homilies, most notably in the opening lines of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* and in the thoroughly eschatological ending of Napier homily 50. It is little wonder that Mary Richards calls eschatology 'a defining theme' of Wulfstan's career.¹ Yet since the publication of Malcolm Godden's influential article 'Apocalypse and Invasion in Anglo-Saxon England', it has become commonplace to assume that Wulfstan's thought underwent a major shift during the composition of the *Sermo Lupi*, during which he abandoned his belief that the Final Days would arrive in the near future in his comparison of the Danish invasions to the trials of the Israelites and to the Anglo-Saxon victory over the Britons in the *Sermo Lupi*.² Such a change, if it happened at all, was short-lived, as Napier 50 makes clear. The evolution of Wulfstan's thought on the Final Days did not end with the last of the eschatological homilies or even with the *Sermo Lupi*, but continued to the end of his life.

Eschatological themes became pervasive throughout Old English literature at the same time that Wulfstan was composing his first series of eschatological homilies; in addition to Wulfstan's works, one may count several sermons by Ælfric and a large number of anonymous homilies, most notably Blickling homilies VII and X and Vercelli homilies II, IV, and IX.³ Milton McC. Gatch attributes the prevalence of such themes first to the fact that the Latin Fathers who exercised the most influence on Anglo-Saxon theology, Augustine of Hippo and Gregory the Great, emphasize eschatology in their writings, and second to the innate appeal of the concept of the Last Judgment to the Anglo-Saxons 'as an appropriate extension of their own "heroic" picture of man's

¹ Mary P. Richards, 'Wulfstan and the Millennium', in *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium*, ed. Michael Frassetto (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), pp. 41–8, at p. 44.

² Malcolm Godden, 'Apocalypse and Invasion in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *From Anglo-Saxon to Early Middle English: Studies Presented to E. G. Stanley*, ed. Malcolm Godden, Douglas Gray, and Terry Hoad (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 130–62. Godden's article is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 7.

³ See R. Morris, ed., *The Blickling Homilies*, EETS os 58, 63, 73 (London: Oxford University Press, 1967); and D. G. Scragg, ed., *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, EETS os 300 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

social nature and destiny . . . [by depicting] Christ, the proper Lord of all mankind, [leading] his faithful retainers to the most decisive and inevitable of victories'.⁴ Richards cites in addition the increasing intensity of Viking raids, noting that they 'seemed to embody the signs of Doomsday described in Matthew'.⁵ The homilists themselves, as Clare Lees notes, 'present their interest in eschatology as a means of instituting Christian vigilance',⁶ pointing out that 'Awareness of the eschatological future governs moral understanding of the present' and elicits 'a state of ever-present watchfulness for the Last Days'.⁷ The focus of an eschatological homily is thus always at least implicitly on the present moment rather than on the coming apocalypse, whether the homilist believes the end to be imminent or in the distant future.

Still, the prevalence of eschatological themes in sermons written in the late 990s and continuing into the first decade of the eleventh century inevitably raises the question of how far, if at all, the eschatological expectations of the Anglo-Saxon homilists were in fact millennially inspired, having been aroused by the prospect of the year 1000. The romantic notion that the advent of the millennial year caused widespread terror throughout Europe has of course long been dismissed by serious scholars; the opposing contention, that the year passed virtually unnoticed, has also come under scrutiny.⁸ More credible is what Edward Peters terms the 'weak thesis'⁹ of the terrors, that is, an acknowledgment of the reality of eschatological expectations in connection with the year 1000, with a corresponding recognition that those expectations exerted an influence that was subtler and more sophisticated than past theories of 'the terrors' contended.

The idea that the world would end in the year 1000 stems from the originally Jewish belief termed 'sabbatical millennialism', that is, that the world would last through six ages, paralleling the six days of creation; each age was expected to last roughly one thousand years. The concept would have reached Anglo-Saxon England through Augustine's *De civitate Dei*; it was then taken up by Bede in his *De temporum ratione*.¹⁰ The basic tabulation of the ages was as follows: the first age was believed to have lasted from Adam to Noah, the second from Noah to Abraham, the third from Abraham to David, the fourth from David to the Babylonian exile, and the fifth from the exiles' return to Jerusalem until the coming of Christ. The sixth age was expected to last until the end of the world, after which would come 'the eternal Sabbath

⁴ Milton McC. Gatch, *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric and Wulfstan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), p. 62.

⁵ Richards, 'Wulfstan', p. 42.

⁶ Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, p. 47.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 82.

⁸ For a good history of the 'terrors' debate, see Edward Peters, 'Mutations, Adjustments, Terrors, Historians, and the Year 1000', in *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium*, ed. Michael Frassetto (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), pp. 9–28.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹⁰ Augustine, *De civitate Dei. Libri XI–XXII*, ed. Bernhard Dombart and Alphonse Kalb (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), pp. 865–6; Bede, *De temporum ratione* in *Beda's opera de temporibus*, ed. Charles Williams Jones (Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1943), ch. 66.

rest, comparable to the rest of the creator on the seventh day'.¹¹ The schema was reinforced in Christianity by the medieval interpretation of Revelation 20: 1–3:

Et vidi angelum descendentem de caelo, habentem clavem abyssi, et catenam magnam in manu sua. Et adprehendit draconem, serpentem antiquum, qui est diabolus et Satanas, et ligavit eum per annos mille, et misit eum in abyssum, et clusit et signavit super illum, ut non seducat amplius gentes, donec consummentur mille anni. Post haec oportet illum solvi modico tempore.

And I saw an angel coming down from heaven, holding in his hand the key to the bottomless pit and a great chain. And he seized the dragon, the ancient serpent, who is the devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years, and threw him into the pit, and shut it and sealed it over him, so that he should deceive the nations no more, until the thousand years were ended. After that he must be loosed for a little while.

The loosing of Satan's bonds was believed to herald the advent of Antichrist at the end of the sixth age, after which would come the *parousia* and the Last Judgment. The sixth age was regarded as providing a recapitulation of the previous ages, beginning as it did with Christ, who was the 'second Adam', and ending with his opposite and adversary Antichrist, who was himself typified by Antiochus Epiphanes, the figure of evil who had concluded the fifth age.¹²

Although some writers have argued that 'the fear of millennial terrors acted immediately on Anglo-Saxons to produce continual apocalyptic expectation and to encourage millenarianistic reading of apocalypses',¹³ most scholars of Anglo-Saxon England play down the importance of the year 1000 when they do not deny its significance altogether.¹⁴ Even those scholars who allow the possibility that the coming of the millennial year did in fact raise eschatological expectations are divided as to precisely whose expectations were raised. In her notes to the eschatological homilies, for example, Bethurum posits that although 'not very learned priests and an illiterate public undoubtedly had a superstitious fear that on the very advent of the year 1000 Satan would be loosed and the Judgement would follow shortly thereafter . . . there is little indication that any but the ignorant would have set a date for the Dies Irae'.¹⁵ By contrast, Malcolm Godden argues that 'this millennial expectation was a feature of the learned establishment rather than popular belief'.¹⁶ Certainly

¹¹ Gatch, *Preaching and Theology*, p. 113.

¹² Richard Kenneth Emmerson, *Antichrist in the Middle Ages: A Study of Medieval Apocalypticism, Art and Literature* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981), p. 17.

¹³ Edward L. Ridsen, *Beasts of Time: Apocalyptic Beowulf* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), p. 47.

¹⁴ For denials that the millennial year was important in Anglo-Saxon thought, see, among others, Milton McC. Gatch, 'The Unknowable Audience of the Blickling Homilies', *Anglo-Saxon England* 18 (1989), 99–115, at p. 113; and Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, pp. 47, 83. For a refutation of this position, see William Prideaux-Collins, "'Satan's Bonds are Extremely Loose": Apocalyptic Expectation in Anglo-Saxon England during the Millennial Era', in *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950–1050*, ed. Richard Landes, Andrew Gow, and David C. van Meter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 289–310.

¹⁵ Bethurum, p. 278.

¹⁶ Malcolm Godden, 'The Millennium, Time and History for the Anglo-Saxons', in *The Apocalyptic*

the learned would have had greater access to and knowledge of the (primarily Latin) writings on the subject, although, as David Verhelst points out, such themes ‘reached into the more educated masses via sermons, mural paintings, and sculpture’.¹⁷

The strictly orthodox position of the medieval Church, based in Matthew 24: 36 and emphasized forcefully by Augustine among others, was that because the Gospel explicitly states that one can know neither the day nor the hour, any speculation as to the time of the end was foolish at best and dangerous if not sinful at worst. This viewpoint is reiterated throughout the majority of Anglo-Saxon eschatological literature. There are, however, two passages in Old English homiletic writing that can perhaps be interpreted as endorsing millennial expectations; at the very least, they make it plain that millennial ideas were not completely absent from Anglo-Saxon thought. In *Blickling Homily 11*, the anonymous homilist follows his statement of the orthodox position with the assertion that we nevertheless ‘know’ (*witon*) that the end is near, for all of the signs of the end have already appeared, with the sole exception of the advent of Antichrist:

forþon þes middangeard nede on ðas eldo endian sceal þe nu andweard is; forþon fife þara syndon agangen on þisse eldo, þonne sceal þes middangeard endian & þisse is þonne se mæsta dæl agangen, efne nigon hund wintra & .lxxi. on þis gear. Ne wæron þas ealle gelic lange, ac on þysson wæs þreo þusend wintra, on sumre læsse, on sumre eft mare. Nis forþon nænig mon þe þæt an wite hu lange he ure Drihten þas gedon wille, hwæper þis þusend sceole beon scyrtre ofer þæt þe lengre. þæt is þonne æghwylcum men swiþe uncuþ, butun urum Drihtne anum.¹⁸

For this middle-earth must necessarily end in the age that is now present, because five of them have passed. In this age then this middle-earth must end, and the greatest part of it has passed, even nine hundred and seventy-one winters this year. Nor were all [the ages] equally long, but in this one were three thousand winters, in certain ones less, in certain ones again more. Nor therefore may anyone know how long our Lord will make this one, whether it will be shorter than that or longer. That is then unknown to every person except our Lord alone.

Godden points out that the passage is most likely corrupt, noting in particular that the homilist’s assertion that the present age has lasted three thousand years is both ‘inaccurate and inconsistent; it is presumably a miscopied reference to one of the earlier ages’.¹⁹ Nevertheless, the statement that most of the present age has passed, together with the precise number of 971 years, not only dates the homily (or its copying) to 971 CE, but also implies an assumption that the sixth age would indeed end after a thousand years, that is, at the millennium. The bracketing of this statement between two assertions of the

Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950–1050, ed. Richard Landes, Andrew Gow, and David C. van Meter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 155–80, at p. 176.

¹⁷ David Verhelst, ‘Adso of Montier-en-Der and the Fear of the Year 1000’, in *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950–1050*, ed. Richard Landes, Andrew Gow, and David C. van Meter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 81–92, at p. 82.

¹⁸ Morris, *Blickling Homilies*, pp. 115–31. All English translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own.

¹⁹ Godden, ‘Millennium’, p. 157.

unknowability of the end may, as William Prideaux-Collins suggests, have been an attempt to avoid open heterodoxy while at the same time revealing the homilist's millennial expectations.²⁰ It may also, however, simply indicate that the homilist, while certain that current events could be interpreted as the portents of the Final Days described in the Gospels and aware of the tradition that the world would end with the sixth age, was nonetheless uncertain as to whether the age would indeed end with the millennial year. The passage is a firm recognition of the concept of sabbatical millennialism, but cannot necessarily be regarded as a statement of the homilist's personal belief in a specific date for the end.

The second reference to millennialism occurs in the last of Wulfstan's early eschatological homilies, *Secundum Marcum* (Bethurum homily V; Napier 18). Having cited Revelation 20: 7, *post mille annos soluetur satanas* ('after a thousand years Satan will be unbound'), Wulfstan comments, *Busend geara and eac ma is nu agan syððan Crist wæs mid mannum on menniscan hīwe, and nu syndon Satanases bendas swyðe toslōpene, and Antecristes tima is wel gehende* (Bethurum 136/44–137/47, 'a thousand years and also more have now passed since Christ was among people in human form, and now Satan's bonds are very loose, and Antichrist's time is well at hand'). Prideaux-Collins argues that the statement proves Wulfstan's own (at least prior) belief that the world would end in the millennial year,²¹ and Gatch notes in reference to this passage that Wulfstan may have been 'forced to alter his eschatological expectations after 1000'.²² Yet given that Wulfstan does not refer to the millennial concept in the earlier eschatological homilies, one wonders whether his statement here is not more in the nature of a rhetorical flourish than an endorsement of millennialism in a sermon that is otherwise devoted to a consideration of time and typology as they relate to the figure of Antichrist, whose advent Wulfstan continues to place in the future. As with the Blickling homilist, although Wulfstan clearly recognizes the millennial concept, the question of his personal belief remains ambiguous.

Nevertheless, Wulfstan apparently did believe, as he asserts in each of the eschatological homilies, that the end of the world would arrive in the near future, and as *Secundum Marcum* makes clear, the passing of the year 1000 did not diminish his certainty. His primary concern throughout the eschatological homilies is not one of chronology, but rather the moral dangers inherent the last of the signs portending the end, the advent of Antichrist.²³ He allows the timing of the Final Days to remain ambiguous, while, in Joyce Hill's words, he 'uses the millennium as a way of framing his moral lessons and injecting those lessons with the urgency which he sees being called for

²⁰ Prideaux-Collins, "'Satan's Bonds'", p. 294.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 295–6.

²² Gatch, *Preaching and Theology*, p. 114.

²³ For full discussions of the Antichrist legend and its development, see Emerson, *Antichrist in the Middle Ages*; Bernard McGinn, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979); and the essays in Richard K. Emerson and Bernard McGinn, eds., *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992).

by the turmoil of the time'.²⁴

The word *antichristus* occurs in the Bible only in a passage from 2 John 7 that may not originally have referred to a specific figure: *multi seductores exierunt in mundum qui non confitentur Iesum Christum venientem in carne; hic est seductor et antichristus* ('many deceivers have gone out into the world who will not acknowledge the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh; this is the deceiver and antichrist'). Several other passages were also understood by medieval theologians as references to Antichrist: perhaps the most important of these is 2 Thessalonians 2: 3–11, in which Paul predicts the coming of *homo peccati, filius perditionis* ('the man of sin, the son of perdition'), who will proclaim himself to be God. His advent will be *in omni virtute et signis et prodigiis mendacibus et in omni seductione iniquitatis* ('with all power and with pretended signs and wonders, and with all wicked deception'), and his reign will last until *Dominus Iesus interficiet spiritu oris sui* ('the Lord Jesus will slay him with the breath of his mouth'). This figure was correlated in the Gospels not only with the *anticristus* of 2 John 7, but also with the false prophets foretold in Matthew 24: 5–6, Mark 13: 5–6, and Luke 21: 8, as well as with the beast of Revelation 13: 13–14, who *fecit signa magna ut etiam ignem faceret de caelo descendere in terram in conspectu hominum et seducit habitantes terram* ('worked great signs, even making the fire come down from heaven to earth in the sight of men, and deceives those who inhabit the earth'). Antichrist was believed to have been prefigured in the Old Testament by the *cornu unum modicum* ('little horn') of Daniel 8: 9, who prospers *ad vesperam at mane, dies duo millia trecenti* (8: 14, 'for two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings'); and by the tyrant of Daniel 11: 20–39, who establishes *abominationem in desolationem* (11: 31 'abomination in desolation'). Wulfstan would also have been familiar with the legend of Antichrist from a number of secondary sources; his homilies reference Augustine, Jerome, Gregory, Isidore of Seville, Bede, Sulpicius Severus, Ambrose, and Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Près. The most important source for the Antichrist story in the late tenth and eleventh centuries, however, was Adso of Montier-en-Der's *De ortu et tempore Anticristi*.²⁵ Wulfstan's interest in Adso's work is evidenced both by his use of Adso's treatise and by the fact that the text is extant in W and V, two of the 'commonplace book' manuscripts. Moreover, an Old English translation of the text, printed by Napier as Homily 42, is found in B and F. While the translation was not done by Wulfstan, it is possible that he commissioned it to be made.²⁶

For Wulfstan in his early sermons, Antichrist is both a literal figure who will arise to persecute the faithful at the end of time and the symbolic embodiment

²⁴ Joyce Hill, 'Ælfric and Wulfstan: Two Views of the Millennium', in *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes in Memory of Lynne Grundy*, ed. Jane Roberts and Janet Nelson (London: King's College London Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, 2000), p. 233, emphasis in the original.

²⁵ Adso Dervensis, *De ortu et tempore Anticristi necnon et tractatus qui ab eo dependunt*, ed. D. Verhelst, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* 45 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976).

²⁶ Bethurum, p. 42. Richard K. Emmerson discusses the Old English version at length in 'From *Libellus* to *Sermo*: The Old English Version of Adso's *Libellus de Anticristo*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 82 (1983), 1–10.

of the power of hypocrisy and deception. Antichrist is the archetype of all false prophets; his claim that he is God incarnate will be the end and culmination of every deliberate falsehood designed by the devil to ensnare ignorant human beings. The Church, and especially its bishops, must therefore combat him even before his literal advent into the world through what we would today call ideological warfare. Such warfare is made more difficult by the fact that as the end approaches fewer miraculous signs of God's power will be in evidence, while the power of deception will grow ever stronger. Antichrist is thus both the subject of Wulfstan's eschatological homilies and his reason for preaching them: although there was little the faithful could do in the face of other signs of the end – wars, famines, earthquakes, pestilence, the darkening of the sun and moon – Antichrist could and must be actively resisted.

Wulfstan's early eschatological homilies consist of two short texts that are each rubricated *De Anticristo*, one in Latin (Bethurum Ia; Napier 11) and one in English (Bethurum Ib; Napier 12); two homilies on the signs of the Final Days as set out in the gospels of Matthew (*Secundum Matheum*, Bethurum II; Napier 14) and Luke (*Secundum Lucam*, Bethurum III; Napier 15); and two longer homilies treating the theme of Antichrist, *De temporibus Anticristi* (Bethurum IV; Napier 16), which is concerned largely with the deceptions of Antichrist, and *Secundum Marcum* (Bethurum V; Napier 18), which focuses on the persecutions and tribulations that will be suffered by the faithful under his reign. However, Bethurum's numerical ordering is neither the exact order in which the homilies occur in the two manuscripts that contain the entire series, nor is it the most likely order of composition.²⁷ All six homilies are extant in C and E, where they are ordered Ia, Ib, V, II, III, IV, although in E Wulfstan's *De cristianitate* (Bethurum Xb; Napier 9) and *Her ongynd be cristendome* (Bethurum Xc; Napier 10) occur between Ib and V rather than preceding the eschatological series by several pages as they do in C. The manuscript ordering is logical in that *Secundum Marcum* draws heavily on the two *De Anticristo* texts, while *De temporibus Anticristi* is less dependent on the short Antichrist texts and may be seen as an extended elaboration on the dangers of the final sign of the Last Days. Three of the homilies are also included in H, where they are copied in the order V, Ib, IV in what was apparently intended to be a composite sermon.²⁸ *Secundum Lucam* recurs in A, where it is unrubricated and follows Napier 50; it may have likewise been intended to be read as part of that homily. The Latin version of *De Anticristo* survives in an additional four manuscripts: V, Cop, Cambridge, St John's College, 42;²⁹ and Madrid, Real Biblioteca del Escorial, T.I.12.

Bethurum's suggestion that the most likely order of composition is II, III, Ia, Ib, IV, V is probably correct: neither *Secundum Matheum* nor *Secundum*

²⁷ Bethurum, p. 103.

²⁸ The texts are copied continuously without line breaks or additional rubrics under the rubric *Secundum Marcum*; the manuscript thus provides rubrics for all its sermons except *De Anticristo* and *De temporibus Anticristi*. See Ker, item 70, p. 373.

²⁹ See J. E. Cross, 'Wulfstan's *De Anticristo* in a Twelfth-Century Worcester Manuscript', *Anglo-Saxon England* 20 (1991), 203–20.

Lucam make extended use of the Antichrist material in Ia or Ib, and Wulfstan's usual method of composition is one of expansion; thus, the short *Secundum Matheum* and *Secundum Lucam* would probably have come first, followed by the two *De Anticristo* texts, on which Wulfstan draws in IV and V. *De temporibus Anticristi* would most likely come next if the internal dating of *Secundum Marcum* can be assumed to make it the last of the early eschatological texts. The six eschatological homilies thus fall neatly into three pairs of two, both in terms of their probable order of composition and their contents.

Lectio sancti evangelii secundum Matheum and *Secundum Lucam* establish Wulfstan's interest in eschatological themes and especially in the subject of the false prophets who will deceive the people during the Final Days. *Secundum Matheum* is a fairly straightforward translation of portions of Matthew 24 that shows no reliance on other source materials and that is certainly the simplest of the five vernacular sermons in both content and style. It opens with the Latin text of Matthew 24: 1–14, 36, and 42, followed by Wulfstan's English translation, and it ends with a short description of Christ displaying the cross and his wounds to the souls assembled on the Day of Judgment and an equally short exhortation to 'do what is necessary for us' (*don swa us þearf is*), that is, to love God above all other things and do his will (*lufian God ofer ealle oðre þing and his willan wyrcan*, Bethurum 122/70³⁰). In his translation, Wulfstan omits Matthew's reference to the Temple in verse 1 and to the Mount of Olives in verse 3, most likely because they would have required explanation for his presumably lay (or possibly mixed) audience.³¹ Verse 12, *et quoniam abundabit iniquitas refrigescet caritas multorum* ('and because wickedness is multiplied, most men's love will grow cool'), is also left untranslated. Gatch points out that the omissions indicate that in this homily Wulfstan is 'avoiding multiple commentary as well as eschewing the mysterious in favor of the moral';³² however, the deliberate omission of 24: 12 may also be attributed to the fact that Wulfstan's major interest in this homily concerns the deceptions perpetrated by the false prophets Christ warns of in the text rather than the iniquity of the people at large. In fact, Wulfstan returns to 24: 12 in the last of the eschatological homilies, *Secundum Marcum*, where his thematic interests coincide more closely with this particular passage.

Wulfstan's additions to the biblical text in his translation make his primary interest in the homily quite clear. Matthew 24: 11 lists *multi pseudoprophete* ('many false prophets') as only one of the portents of the end of the world, along with wars and rumors of wars, famine, earthquakes, and persecutions (24: 6–7, 9). Wulfstan translates the full passage, but expands the biblical text when he reaches the subject of false prophets. Whereas Matthew cites Jesus as telling the apostles, *Videte ne quis uos seducat. Multi enim uenient in nomine meo dicentes: ego sum Cristus; et multos seducent* (24: 4–5, 'See that no one leads you astray. Many will come in my name, saying: I am Christ, and they will

³⁰ Bethurum prints 'over ealle oðre þing', but this is a clear error in transcription from E, which reads 'ofer' rather than 'over'.

³¹ Gatch, *Preaching and Theology*, p. 108.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 108.

lead many astray'), Wulfstan's expanded translation emphasizes the lies and deception of the false prophets. The simple admonishment *Videte ne quis uos seducat* becomes the more elaborate warning *þæt hi wære wurdan þæt hy ænig man to swicollice ne bepæhte mid leaslicre lare and mid egeslican gylpe* (Bethurum 120/37–9, 'that [the apostles] had need to be careful that no one deceive them too fraudulently with lying teaching and terrible boasts'). Likewise, the 'many' who will come in Christ's name will *leaslice leogeð and egeslice gilpeð, namað hine sylfne and hiwað to góde, swilce hit Crist sy* (120/40–1, 'lie falsely and boast terribly, name themselves [God] and pretend to be God, as if it were Christ himself'). Matthew 24: 11, *multi pseudoprophete surgent et seducent multos* ('many false prophets will arise and lead many astray') becomes *swiciende licceteras þonne arisað and brædað to swyðe and ðurh unlare forlærað to manege* (121/54–5, 'deceitful liars will then arise and spread too widely and through false teaching lead too many astray'). Wulfstan's elaborations are couched in language that is both more colorful and in its paranomastic repetition (*leaslicre lare / leaslice leogeð; egeslican gylpe / egeslice gilpeð*) more memorable than that of the evangelist. In addition, that Wulfstan was thinking specifically about the figure of Antichrist in connection with the false prophets – and that he expected his audience to be familiar with the name if not the full legend – is evidenced by the fact that he interprets the passage as a direct reference to Antichrist, even though Antichrist is not mentioned by Matthew: *Dæt bið witodlice þæt he mænde we witan ful georne þa sorga and ða sarnessa þe on woruld becomað foran to þam timan þe Antecrist wedeð and ealle woruld bregeþ* (121/49–52, 'It is certain that he meant for us to recognize the sorrow and the pain that will come into the world before the time when Antichrist rages and terrifies all the world').

Wulfstan goes out of his way to quote the two passages from Matthew in which the evangelist points out that no one knows or can know the time of the end, faithfully translating *Uerumptamen diem illam et horam nemo scit, neque angeli celorum nisi pater solus* (Matthew 24: 36, 'But no man knows the day and the hour, nor the angels in heaven, except the Father alone') as *swaþeah-hwæðere nis se man on eorðan ne se engel on heofonan þe wite þæne andagan butan gode sylfum* (Bethurum 121/60–2, 'nevertheless there is no one on earth nor any angel in heaven who knows the appointed day except God himself'). However, he modifies the evangelist's further injunction, *Quapropter uigilate, quia nescitis qua hora dominus uester uenturus sit* (Matthew 24: 42, 'Therefore watch, because you do not know the hour your Lord will come'), to omit the admonition that the hour is unknown and to include instead an assertion, in what comes close to being a direct contradiction of the preceding sentence, that we in fact know 'with certainty' (*mid gewisse*) that the hour is quite near: *ðy man sceal wacigean and warnian symle þæt man geara weorðe huru to ðam dome, weald hwænne he us to cyme, we witan mid gewisse þæt hit þærto nealæcð georne* (121/62–4, 'thus a man must watch and take heed always so that he may indeed be prepared for the judge when he comes to us, for we know with certainty that it is very near'). As Godden remarks, 'in the face of Christ's own words, Wulfstan's *witan*, "we know", is curiously strong' and may raise the possibility

that Wulfstan had the advent of the millennium on his mind in this passage.³³ And yet as Godden also notes, at the same time Wulfstan pushes the Final Days farther than a few short years into the future by asserting with equal certainty (*to gewisse*, 121/57) that the end will not come until the Gospel has been preached throughout the entire world – a portent not found in Matthew 24.³⁴ The resulting ambiguity concerning Wulfstan's belief as to the exact time of the end may well have been deliberate, for it persists throughout the remaining five eschatological homilies.

In *Secundum Lucam*, Wulfstan similarly interprets the signs of the end found in Luke 21 as explicit metaphors for the reign of Antichrist, even though Antichrist is again not mentioned in the biblical passage.³⁵ Unlike *Secundum Matheum*, however, *Secundum Lucam* is comprised for the most part of Wulfstan's interpretation of a severely abbreviated pericope from Luke 21: 25 rather than an extended translation of a full quotation. The pericope, *Erunt signa in sole et luna et stellis, et reliqua* ('There will be signs in the sun and the moon and the stars, etc.'), serves to introduce Wulfstan's major theme in the homily: that disasters in the natural world result from the sins of humanity, and that because both human sin and natural disasters are worsening, the age of Antichrist is at hand. He begins with a comparison of the Judgment Day fires to Noah's flood that Gatch suggests may have been inspired by Ælfric's association of the Last Judgment both with the Flood and with the burning of Sodom in *De die iudicii*.³⁶ That homily, however, most likely dates to sometime after 1000,³⁷ and it is more likely that Wulfstan found the comparison independently in what would have been Ælfric's source as well: Luke 17: 25, *Et sicut factum est in diebus Noe, ita erit et in diebus Filii hominis* ('As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be in the days of the Son of Man'), and Luke 17: 29–30, *qua die autem exiit Loth a Sodomis pluit ignem et sulphur de caelo et omnes perdidit, secundum haec erit qua die Filius hominis revelabitur* ('as on the day when Lot went out from Sodom fire and brimstone rained from heaven and destroyed them all, so it will be when the Son of Man is revealed'). All this, Wulfstan says, was *for synnum* (Bethurum 123/7–8, 'because of sin'), just as the many and varied evils (*fela yfela and mistlicra*) that the English are currently experiencing are *eal . . . for synnum* (123/9–10, 'all . . . because of sin'). But more and worse evils will come with the advent of Antichrist, and that is coming very soon (*hit nealæcð nu swyðe georne*, 123/13–14), as is evident in the fact that the world is ever worsening (*hit is on worulde a swa leng swa wyrse*, 123/14). For an example, Wulfstan turns back to Matthew 24: 7 in what is probably the first reference in the homilies to the Danish invasions: *ælpeodige men and utancumene swyðe us swencað, ealswa Crist on his godspelle swutollice*

³³ Godden, 'Millennium', p. 168.

³⁴ Bethurum notes that this is 'probably a warning against fixing the exact day of the end', p. 286n.

³⁵ The passage from Luke is parallel to Matthew 24: 29 ff., which Wulfstan ignored in the earlier homily.

³⁶ Gatch, *Preaching and Theology*, p. 109. For Ælfric's homily, see Pope, *Homilies of Ælfric*, II, pp. 584–612.

³⁷ Pope, *Homilies of Ælfric*, II, p. 585.

sæde þæt scolde geweorðan. He cwæð: *Surget gens contra gentem, et reliqua*. Ðæt is on Englisc, upp ræsað þeoda, he cwæð, and wiðerræde weorþað and hetelice winnað and sacað heom betweonan for ðam unrihte þe to wide wyrð mid mannum on eorðan (Bethurum 124/21–6; 'Foreigners and strangers severely oppress us, just as Christ clearly said would happen in his gospel. He said: *Surget gens contra gentem, et reliqua*. That is in English, nations will rise up, he said, and become opposed, and strive violently and contend among themselves because of the injustice that has become too widespread among people on earth'). The passage is both a foreshadowing of the end of the homily, where Wulfstan's focus turns from calamities of the natural world to his more usual interest, the moral state of the English people, and the first statement of a theme that recurs throughout Wulfstan's homilies dealing with the Danish invasions: the cause of the invasions lies in the moral failure and sins of the nation.

The next paragraph begins with a reminder that although the earth was created pure at its beginning, as it nears its end it is increasingly defiled by human sin. Thus not only do nations strive against nations, but the natural world also strives against sinful humanity. Wulfstan cites Wisdom 5: 21, *Pugnabit pro deo orbis terrarum contra insensatos homines* ('The circumference of the world will fight for God against foolish men'), translating the passage as *eal woruld winneð swyðe for synnum ongean þa oferhogan þe gode nellað hyran* (Bethurum 125/37–8, 'all the world strives greatly against the proud who will not obey God because of their sins') and adding examples of his own: *Seo heofone us winð wið þonne heo us sendeð styrynlice stormas and orf and æceras swyðe amyrreð. Seo eorðe us winð wið þonne heo forwyrneð eorðlices wæstmas and us unweoda to fela asendeð* (125/38–41, 'Heaven strives against us when it sternly sends storms that greatly injure cattle and crops. The earth strives against us when it withholds earthly fruits and sends us too many weeds'). Only then does Wulfstan turns to a specific discussion of his opening passage from Luke, as if the portents described there were merely a more extreme example of the earthly misfortunes he has been discussing: *Eac hit awriten is, ðæt sunne aþystrað ær worulde ende and mona adeorcað and steorran hreosað for manna synnum* (125/41–3, 'It is also written that the sun will grow dark before the world ends and the moon will darken and the stars fall because of the people's sins').

The celestial signs are not to be understood only, if at all, on a literal level, for Wulfstan adds immediately that *þonne Antecrist weðeð þæt hit bið gelic þam swylce hit swa sy* (Bethurum 125/44–5, 'when Antichrist rages that it will be like as if it were so'). In what follows, Wulfstan borrows from part of a sermon on Luke 21 by Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Près,³⁸ shortening and adapting the text. Like Abbo, Wulfstan interprets the darkening of the sun as referring to the tradition that God will withhold his power during Antichrist's reign (*þonne God nele cyðan on Anticristes timan his mægen ne his mihta*, 125/45–6) and

³⁸ Ute Önnertfors, ed., *Abbo von Saint-Germain-des-Près: 22 Predigten* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1985), pp. 66–71. For a discussion of Wulfstan's use of Abbo, see J. E. Cross and Alan Brown, 'Wulfstan and Abbo at Saint-Germain-des-Près', *Mediaevalia* 15 (1993 for 1989), 71–91.

that of the moon as signifying *þæt Godes halgan ænige tacna þonne ne wyrcað swa swa hy oft ær dydan* (125/48–9, ‘that God’s saints will not work any signs as they often did before’). But whereas Abbo incorporates a second biblical quotation concerning the darkening of the moon – *Et luna tota facta est quasi sanguis* (Revelation 6: 12, ‘and the moon will become like blood’) – in order to interpret the sign as referring further to the blood of Christian martyrs, Wulfstan omits the citation, thereby sharpening the contrast between the lack of true miracles and the false miracles to be worked by Antichrist and his followers during that fateful time. The third portent, that the stars will fall from the heavens, brings Wulfstan to his primary concern of the hypocrisy and deceit that will prevail with the coming of Antichrist: *And steorran, hit cweð, hreosað ufene of heofonum; ðæt is, þæt licceteras and leaslice cristene hrædlice hreosað of rihtan geleafan and to antecriste geornlice bugað and weorþaþ his gefylstan eallum heora mihtum* (125/50–3, ‘And the stars, it says, will fall from heaven. That is, that liars and false Christians will quickly fall from correct belief and eagerly bow down to Antichrist and honor his helpers with all their might’). The passage is based closely on Abbo, but is again shortened from Abbo’s more extended interpretation, in which the citation from Luke is linked both to Matthew 24: 29, *Et stelle cadent de celo* (‘and the stars will fall from the sky’) and to an explicit identification of Antichrist with the dragon of Revelation 12: 4, *Et cauda eius trahebat tertiam partem stellarum caeli et misit eas in terram* (‘And its tail was pulling a third part of the stars from the sky, and it cast them to the earth’). Wulfstan keeps his focus squarely on the liars and false Christians.

As Bethurum notes, allegory is extremely uncharacteristic of Wulfstan’s writing;³⁹ in fact, this passage is one of the only extended uses of allegorical interpretation in the Wulfstan homiletic canon. Abbo’s discussion of the multiplication of hypocrites and deceivers during the Last Days, led by the arch-hypocrite Antichrist, is probably what initially drew Wulfstan’s attention to the sermon; without the attraction of one of his favorite themes, he most likely would have eschewed Abbo’s allegorical reading in favor of a more straightforward interpretation. The allegory in *Secundum Lucam* serves a second purpose, however, in keeping Wulfstan’s audience from focusing too closely on the mystery and terror of the celestial events in order to concentrate their attention on the more important moral danger: when God withholds his miracles and those of his saints during the Final Days, faith will be difficult if not impossible to maintain for those who have not been enlightened as to the nature of Antichrist, his false prophecies, and his deceptive miracles. ‘Liars and false Christians’ will quickly fall away from the truth – but if they are in fact ‘liars’ and ‘false’ Christians, they have already fallen, and their apparent adherence to Christianity is itself a deception. It is their actions, and those of their leader Antichrist, that will engender *egsa se mæsta þe æfre ær wære and ehtnes seo mæste* (Bethurum 125/53–4, ‘the greatest terror and the

³⁹ Bethurum, p. 288n. Her vague suggestion that the allegory may have been taken from ‘the kind of imagery the hymns had made familiar’ results from the fact that the Abbo sermon was unpublished at the time of Bethurum’s edition.

greatest persecution that ever was'). Those of the faithful who fail the test will be lost eternally, and the homily accordingly continues with the first of Wulfstan's enumerations of the horrors of hell, unsoftened, as Gatch points out, by the parallel portrait of heaven found in Abbo.⁴⁰

As in *Secundum Mattheum*, the time frame of the prophesied events is left ambiguous: the celestial portents of the end are set in the future, but the worsening of the world as manifested in the sins of the people and the consequent tribulations they suffer in the form of the Danish invasions and the striving of nature against humanity (both of which may be interpreted as signs of the end) are events taking place in the present. They must be dealt with in the present through faith, repentance, and atonement. The implication throughout is that although the time of Antichrist is coming soon, it is still not quite here, and thus the task of the faithful is to prepare themselves as quickly as possible for that future through immediate repentance and personal reformation. Each homily therefore ends with the same remedy: *utan lufian god ofer ealle oðre þing and his willan wyrcan* (Bethurum 121/69–122/70, 126/77, 'let us love God above all other things and work his will').

The Latin and Old English versions of *De Anticristo* mark a definitive turn in Wulfstan's writing away from a fairly general expression of eschatological themes (albeit one with a particular focus on false prophets) to the specific subject of Antichrist. In these sermons Wulfstan not only draws for the first time on the Antichrist material in Daniel and Revelation, but also on several secondary sources focusing specifically on Antichrist – Augustine's third homily on John, Gregory's *Moralia in Job*, and possibly Adso's *De ortu et tempore Anticristi*.⁴¹ Having written two relatively simple homilies based on New Testament sources into which he interpolated the figure of Antichrist, Wulfstan may have felt the need to research his subject further in preparation for the longer, more complex and sophisticated sermons that end the eschatological series.

The Latin *De Anticristo* is for the most part a compilation of quotations and paraphrases taken from the sources cited above. Bethurum suggests that it may have been composed as an outline or set of notes for preaching in English rather than as a homily *per se*;⁴² however, the fact that it survives in multiple manuscripts from both the eleventh and twelfth centuries suggests that it also circulated fairly widely as an independent sermon. The text contains a number of ideas new to the homiletic series, albeit for the most part commonplaces of the Antichrist tradition. Wulfstan's definition of Antichrist as *contrarius Christi* (Bethurum 113/6, 'opponent to Christ'), is taken from Augustine's third homily on John (although the definition is quoted from Isidore's *Sententia* and is found in Adso as well),⁴³ also from Augustine's

⁴⁰ Gatch, *Preaching and Theology*, p. 110.

⁴¹ There are no specific quotations from Adso in either version of *De Anticristo*; however, the majority of the material Wulfstan uses is also contained in Adso.

⁴² Bethurum, p. 283.

⁴³ Isidorus Hispalensis, *Sententiae*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 111 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), I, ch. 25, 1–3; Augustine, PL 35, 1999.

homily is the idea that those who profess Christianity but neither live by it nor teach it to others – that is, those who are the ‘liars’ and ‘false Christians’ of *Secundum Lucam* – are themselves ‘antichrists’. Wulfstan cites Gregory for the parallel idea that although many of those living today will not live to see Antichrist with their own eyes, his limbs (*membris*, 113/7) may be already be found.⁴⁴ Even the elect would be corrupted by Antichrist, if it were possible; however, for the sake of the elect God will shorten the days. The extended word-play on *si fieri potest* is, as Bethurum notes, paraphrased and condensed from Gregory as well.⁴⁵

Daniel 7: 25 is cited for the length of time Antichrist is expected to rule: *tempus et tempora et dimidium tempus* (Bethurum 113/20–1, ‘a time and times and half a time’; i.e., three and a half years), or, as Wulfstan quotes next from Revelation 11: 2, *mensibus xlii* (113/22, ‘forty-two months’). The description in Revelation 11: 3–13 of two witnesses who are given power to prophesy for 1260 days is also the ultimate source for the idea, found here for the first time in Wulfstan’s work and possibly taken from Adso, that God will send the prophets Enoch and Elias to preach against Antichrist and be martyred. Wulfstan’s account of the *bestia que ascendit de abyssu* (114/24–5, ‘the beast who rises from the abyss’) to destroy them is paraphrased from Revelation 11: 7–8. It may not be too speculative to imagine that Wulfstan at this point saw his role as equivalent to theirs, becoming in an odd way a precursor to (as well as a descendant of) Enoch and Elias in their preaching against Antichrist at the end of time. And indeed the emphasis in the final two paragraphs is on the necessity for preachers (*unusquisque . . . qui in ecclesia predicator est*, ‘any one of those . . . who is a preacher in the church’, Bethurum 114/30) to warn the faithful daily about the dangers of the end and the severity of the persecutions that will come; the emphasis indicates that *De Anticristo* is addressed primarily to a clerical audience. One warning, taken from Matthew 10: 21, introduces a theme that recurs throughout a number of Wulfstan’s later homilies, including the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, that is, the disloyalty that will occur within families: *tradet frater fratrem ad mortem et pater filium, et insurgent filii in parentes, et odio eos habebunt inuicem* (Bethurum 114/37–8, ‘brother will betray brother to death, and the father his son, and sons will rise up against their parents, and they will have mutual hatred for each other’).

The Old English version of *De Anticristo* is not a literal translation of the Latin text; rather, the ideas found in the Latin are reworked and simplified to suit an audience that was perhaps less well educated than those for whom the Latin homily was designed – if, indeed, the Latin text was intended to be anything more than working notes. A less-educated audience, however, does not mean an entirely lay audience: although the first part of the homily could easily be addressed to a lay or mixed audience, the second half is directed once again towards the clergy (*eallum godes bydelum*, Bethurum 117/25, ‘all God’s preachers’; *sacerda gehwylc*, 117/28, ‘each priest’).

⁴⁴ *Moralia in Job* 28, ch. 38, PL 76, 484.

⁴⁵ Bethurum, p. 283n.

Wulfstan introduces his theme with a call for his listeners to hold fast to their Christian beliefs before he turns to the twin definitions of 'antichrists' and 'Antichrist' that began the Latin text. *Contrarius Cristo* is translated somewhat loosely as *Godes wiðersaca* (Bethurum 116/8, 'God's adversary') despite the fact that Wulfstan must at this point have been familiar with Ælfric's translation of *ðwyrlic Crist*, 'the one who is opposed to Christ'.⁴⁶ Here, Wulfstan is making an important moral point: his listeners must be mindful not only of the future advent of the literal Antichrist, but also of the present danger that, by falling into sin, they could become antichrists, God's adversaries, themselves: *Se bið Godes wiðersaca þe Godes lage and lare forlæt, and ðurh deofles lare of ðam deð ðe his cristendome to gebyrð, and on synnum hine sylfne to swyðe befyleð oððon oðerne man on synna belædeð* (Bethurum 116/9–12; 'He is God's adversary who abandons God's laws and teachings and through the devil's teachings makes ill use of that which belongs to his Christianity, and then, being himself in sin, too severely befouls or leads other people into sin').

Wulfstan omits the references in the Latin text to the elect, as well as to the length of time Antichrist can be expected to reign, to the prophets Enoch and Elias, and to the beast of Revelation. He turns instead back to Matthew 24: 21, reminding his audience that during the time of Antichrist, *swa mycel earfoðnes gewyrð on mænige wisan gyt wide on worulde, þæs þe bec secgað, þurh deofles bearn þe unriht dreogað, swa næfre ær on worulde ne gewearð* (Bethurum 117/18–20, 'such great affliction will occur in many ways throughout the world, as the book says, through the devil's son, who will do such evil as never happened before in the world'). As in the earlier homilies, the timing of the Final Days is ambiguous. The warning from Gregory found in the Latin text that not all who are alive today will be alive at the time of Antichrist is emphasized through repetition, yet the admonition itself works two ways: it may be read, as Bethurum notes, as an indication that Wulfstan 'was not ready to date the end of the world';⁴⁷ however, as Malcolm Godden points out, the sentence also implies that at least some of the audience will indeed live that long.⁴⁸ Moreover, Wulfstan adds that even if not all will live to see the final days, *þeah we agan þearfe þæt we godcunde heorda warnian nu georne hu hy þam deofle Antecriste sylfan wærlicast magan þonne wiðstandan* (118/31–4, 'still we have need now earnestly to warn our spiritual flocks how they may then most warily withstand the devil Antichrist himself'). And he assures his listeners that that time is very near, *forðam þeos woruld is fram dæge to dæge a swa leng swa wyrse* (117/23–4, 'because this world is from day to day always the longer the worse', i.e., 'the longer this world goes on from day to day the worse it gets').

Both the Latin and the Old English versions of *De Anticristo* are short; the Latin text comprises 55 lines in Bethurum's edition, the Old English only 40.

⁴⁶ Found in the *Preface* to the *Catholic Homilies*; see Peter Clemoes, ed., *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series*, EETS ss 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 175, line 79. Hereafter cited in the text by page and line number.

⁴⁷ Bethurum, p. 286n.

⁴⁸ Godden, 'Millennium', p. 167.

Both are probably to be considered preliminary essays in preparation for the two longer, more fully developed sermons on Antichrist that were to follow: *De temporibus Anticristi* and *Secundum Marcum*. Together these two homilies contain Wulfstan's fullest development of the Antichrist theme. But although the homilies deal with the same material from the same sources, the emphasis in each differs markedly. Whereas *De temporibus Anticristi* provides Wulfstan's fullest explication of the deceptions of Antichrist and the necessity of preparing the faithful to resist them, *Secundum Marcum* turns its attention to the general breakdown of society that accompanies – or will accompany – the advent of Antichrist.

De temporibus Anticristi has as its main source Ælfric's Old English *Preface* to the *Catholic Homilies*; it is also the first of Wulfstan's homilies to make specific and extended use of Adso's treatise. Although Ælfric's major source for his *Preface* is also Adso, Wulfstan apparently used both Adso and Ælfric independently, adding material from Adso not found in Ælfric. All three works provide a history of Antichrist and his reign; their differences stem from the varying circumstances and purposes of the three writers. In order to understand precisely how Wulfstan's homily makes use of this material, it is useful to look at each version of Antichrist's history in some detail.

Adso's work is a short treatise on Antichrist written sometime between 945 and 954 in the form of a letter to Queen Gerberga, wife of the Frankish King Louis IV d'Outremer, who desired, Adso says, *scire de Anticristi impietate et persecutione, necnon et potestate eius et generatione*⁴⁹ ('to learn about the wickedness and persecution of Antichrist, as well as his power and origin'). Adso accordingly provides a biography of Antichrist in standard hagiographic format and style, with particular emphasis on the ways in which the life of Antichrist provides a perverse mirror image of the life of Jesus.⁵⁰ Like Jesus, Antichrist will come from Jewish origins; in some versions of the legend he is even said to be born of a union between the devil and a virgin. He will travel to Jerusalem, where he will be accepted as a new Messiah, rebuild the temple, and perform miracles that imitate Christ's, including raising the dead. He will feign his own death and rise again in three days; however, his actual death – killed by God or, in some versions, the Archangel Michael – will occur on the Mount of Olives as he is preparing to ascend into heaven.⁵¹ Yet Adso is careful not to carry the parallels too far: for example, he asserts that those who claim Antichrist will be born of a virgin alone are wrong, and he emphasizes that the conception of Antichrist will be the result of ordinary human sexual intercourse; his evil will stem not from the manner of his conception, but from the fact that the devil will enter his mother's womb to corrupt the child before it is born.⁵² Thus while Antichrist will indeed be thoroughly evil, he will not be

⁴⁹ Adso Dervensis, *De ortu et tempore Anticristi*, p. 20.

⁵⁰ For a discussion of Adso's work, see Richard K. Emmerson, 'Antichrist as Anti-Saint: The Significance of Abbot Adso's *Libellus de Anticristo*', *American Benedictine Review* 30 (1979), 175–90.

⁵¹ Emmerson, 'Antichrist', p. 184.

⁵² Verhelst in Adso Dervensis, *De ortu et tempore Anticristi*, p. 23.

a true incarnation of the devil in the same way Christ is the incarnation of God.

Adso's purpose in writing the treatise was not to warn the queen or others that the time of Antichrist was at hand; in fact, he is quick to reassure his audience that the last days have not yet arrived. He interprets 2 Thessalonians 2: 3 (*nisi venerit discessio primum*, 'unless the rebellion comes first') to mean that Antichrist will not appear until all the kingdoms once subject to Rome have defected. He asserts that the Franks have become the heirs of the Roman Empire through Charlemagne, and thus *quandiu reges Francorum durauerint, qui Romanum imperium tenere debent, Romani regni dignitas ex toto non peribit*⁵³ ('as long as the kings of the Franks, who rightfully possess the Roman Empire, shall last, the dignity of the Roman realm will not completely perish'). He goes on to predict the coming of a 'last emperor', a Frankish king who will reunite a universal Roman Empire with a universal Christian church. Not until that king has ended his reign in what David Verhelst terms 'an eschatological act of free will', that is, by abdicating his crown in the city of Jerusalem, will the coming of Antichrist and the end of the world be at hand.⁵⁴

Ælfric reuses the material he translates from Adso to suit his own needs. Ælfric's stated objective in writing the *Catholic Homilies* as a whole is to ensure that his English-speaking audience will have *god lar* ('good doctrine'), because, he says, *ic geseah 7 gehyrde mycel gedwyld on manegum englisum bocum* (174/50-1, 'I have seen and heard of great error/heresy in many English books').⁵⁵ Ælfric emphasizes that the correction of error assumes increasing importance as the advent of Antichrist draws near: *menn behofiað godre lare swiðost on þisum timan þe is geendung þyssere worulde* (174/55-7, 'men are especially in need of good doctrine in this time, which is the end of this world'). Correct doctrine, as it is found in well-written books, can give human beings the courage and enduring faith necessary to withstand Antichrist's temptations: *Gehwá mæg þe eaðelicor þa toweardan costnunge acuman ðurh godes fultum. gif hé bið þurh bôclice lare getrymmed. for ðan ðe ða beoð gehealdene þe oð ende on geleafan þurhwuniað* (175/67-9, 'Each person may resist the coming temptation more easily, through God's help, if he is encouraged through book learning, because those who persevere in their belief until the end will be saved'). Ælfric has no reason to want to reassure his audience that any time is left before the end, and he accordingly omits Adso's references to the last emperor in order to emphasize the nearness and horror of the final days. He also omits most of the narrative detail concerning the life of Antichrist that Adso so carefully organizes and records, but he retains a few incidents and details that he can use to further his theme of the prevalence of error and the importance of correct doctrine to be able to recognize the truth.

Thus, although Ælfric states that Antichrist will be both a human man and

⁵³ Ibid., p. 26.

⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 82-3.

⁵⁵ As Godden points out, here Ælfric is following one of his primary sources for the *Catholic Homilies* as a whole, the homiliary of Paul the Deacon. See *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, EETS ss 18 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 3.

a true devil (*mennisc mann 7 soð deofol*, 175/73–4), just as Christ is true God and true man, he also reiterates and accentuates Adso's assertion that Antichrist will be born of human parents, citing Adso's example that Antichrist will be born of a virgin alone as an instance of the sort of error he intends to correct in his work. Moreover, whereas Adso enumerates the wonders Antichrist will perform as counterparts to Christ's miracles, stating as one example (based on an identification between Antichrist and the beast of Revelation 13) that Antichrist *faciet ignem de celo terribiliter uenire*⁵⁶ ('will make fire come down from heaven in a terrifying way'), Ælfric points out that sending fire from heaven is in fact beyond the power of Antichrist, just as it was beyond the power of the devil when he sent fire from above to destroy Job's flocks: *Ne sende se deofol ða fyr of heofenum. þeah ðe hit ufan come. for ðan ðe he sylf næs on heofonum. syððan he for his modignysse of aworpen wæs; Ne eac se wælhreowa antecrist næfð þa mihte þæt he heofenlic fyr asendan mæge. ðeah ðe hé þurh deofles cræft hit swa gehiwiige* (Clemoes 176/102–6; 'The devil did not send the fire from heaven, although it came from above, because he himself was not in heaven after he was cast out for his pride. Nor also does the cruel Antichrist have the power to send heavenly fire, although through the devil's craft he may make it appear to do so'). Likewise, Ælfric believes Adso errs in asserting that Antichrist *mortuos etiam in conspectu hominem suscitari*⁵⁷ ('will raise the dead in the sight of men') because the power to raise the dead is God's alone. He corrects Adso's error by stating rather that *Hé 7 his gingran awyrdað manna lichaman digellice ðurh deofles cræft. 7 gehælað hí openlice on manna gesihðe. ac hé ne mæg nænne gehælan. þe god sylf ær geuntrumode* (Clemoes 175/81–4, 'he and his followers will harm men's bodies secretly through the devil's power, and heal them openly in men's sight, but he may not heal any whom God himself has made ill').

In *De temporibus Anticristi*, Wulfstan uses material from both Adso's letter and Ælfric's *Preface* to create a new homily emphasizing 'the necessity for repentance and good works in view of the imminence of the Last Day'.⁵⁸ Like both Adso and Ælfric, Wulfstan highlights the contrastive parallels between Christ and Antichrist: whereas Christ is true God and true man (*soð god and soð mann*, Bethurum 128/7–8), Antichrist will be truly both a devil and a man (*soðlice deofol and mann*, 127/8); Christ brought help and comfort to humanity, while Antichrist will bring terror and afflictions; Christ healed the sick, but Antichrist will injure the healthy so that he may perform the false miracle of bringing them back to health. Most importantly, whereas Christ brought the true faith to the world, Antichrist will endeavor through deception to turn believers away from Christianity to falsehood.

To the question of why God would allow Antichrist to deceive the unwary and persecute the faithful, Wulfstan gives two answers: first, that those who can be deceived will be so sinful as to deserve such temptation, and second,

⁵⁶ Adso Dervensis, *De ortu et tempore Anticristi*, p. 24.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 24–5.

⁵⁸ Bethurum, p. 282.

that God wills that the faithful be quickly purged of their sins while still on earth through persecution and martyrdom, so that they will be sinless at the time of the Last Judgment. In a striking temporal elision, Wulfstan brings the time of Antichrist within the century, noting that although those who have been dead a hundred years may by now have been purged of their sins, *we motan nyde þæt stiðre þolian . . . nu we þæne fyrst nabbað þe þa hæfdon þe wiðforan us wæron* (Bethurum 129/30–3, 'we may need to suffer more harshly . . . [for] we do not now have the time that those who were before us had'). He concludes this section of the homily by reminding his audience that *ne cymð ure æfre ænig to Godes rice ær we beon æfre ælcere synne swa clæne amerede swa æfre ænig gold mæg clænost amerod weorðan* (130/34–6, 'none of us will come into God's kingdom before we have been purified of each and every sin as clean as any gold may be purified'). The simile is a patristic commonplace; however, Wulfstan borrows it in this instance from Ælfric, who also states in his *Preface* that the elect will be cleansed of sin through the ordeal of Antichrist's persecutions, *swa swa gold bið on fyre afandod* (175/93, 'just as gold is purified in the fire').

Wulfstan's particular concern in *De temporibus Anticristi* is that his audience be prepared to recognize and resist the deceptions of Antichrist, and the material he takes from his sources is consistently modified to emphasize the theme of deceit. Like Ælfric, Wulfstan omits virtually all of the narrative material from Adso's work, replacing it with moral exhortation and dire admonitions concerning the power of Antichrist and the punishments awaiting those who succumb to him. When he repeats the assertion that Antichrist will make fire come from above, Wulfstan briefly acknowledges Ælfric's concerns with a concessionary clause, *swylce hit of heofonum cume* (131/63, 'as if it comes from heaven'), and goes on to state that anyone who worships Antichrist for fear of that fire *sceal aa on helle on ecan bryne wunian* (131/65–132/66, 'shall dwell forever in hell in eternal fire'). It should be noted here that while Ælfric clearly differentiates between Antichrist and the devil and states that neither one could truly bring fire from heaven, Wulfstan equates the two, saying that Antichrist will bring down fire and burn many people with it, just as he did in the past with Job's possessions (*ealswa he hwilum ær iobes æhta dyde*, 131/64). Yet he makes a subtle differentiation between them the end of the homily, when he states that *Se sylfa deofol þe on helle is, þæt is se þe þonne wyrð on þam earmsceapenan men antecriste and bið soðlice ægðer ge deofol ge man* (132/71–3, 'The same devil who is in hell, that is the one who will then be within the wretched man Antichrist, and truly be both devil and man'). Here Wulfstan sees Antichrist as inhabited or possessed by the devil, and thus both devil and man, but not as the devil incarnate.

Wulfstan also repeats Ælfric's point that Antichrist can heal only those whom he himself has first injured, but Wulfstan is not concerned, as is Ælfric, that his audience might ascribe too much power to Antichrist; rather he is anxious to make sure they understand just how evil and deceptive Antichrist will be: *He bið eal unwrenca full. Donne beswicð he swyðe fela manna þurh þæt, þæt he gebrocað mænige man dihllice and gehæleð eft ætforan mannum þær hy on*

lociað, þonne geseoð hy hwæt he þonne deð and nytan na hwæt he ær dyde. Ælc yfel he mæg don, and ælc he deð (Bethurum 131/58–62; ‘He is full of evil stratagems. He will deceive very many men through the way that he injures many men secretly and heals them afterwards in front of men while they watch, when they see what he does then and not what he did before. He may do any evil thing, and he will do every evil thing’). To further emphasize the theme of Antichrist’s deception and the necessity for the faithful to recognize and resist him, Wulfstan turns to a passage in Adso’s letter in which he enumerates the three ways in which Antichrist will try to tempt the Elect, through bribery, through terror, and through signs and wonders: *Quos vero non poterit muneribus corrumpere, superabit terrore. Quos autem terrore non poterit, signis et miraculis seducere temptabit. Quos nec signis poterit, in conspectu omnium miserabili morte cruciatos crudeliter necabit*⁵⁹ (‘Those he cannot corrupt with gifts, he will overcome with terror. Those he cannot overcome with terror, he will try to seduce with signs and miracles. Those he cannot seduce with signs, he will torture cruelly and miserably put to death in the sight of all’). Wulfstan’s translation of these lines reorders the list to emphasize Antichrist’s deceptiveness: *Se gesawenlica deofol wyrcð fela wundra and segð þæt he God sylfa beo, and mid his gedwimerum mæst ælcne man beswicð; and þa þe he elles beswican ne mæg, þa he wyle neadunga genydan, gyf he mæg, þæt hi Godes ætsacan and him to gebugan. Gyf hi ðonne þæt nellað, þonne sculan hi ehtnessa mycle and eac earmlicne deað geþolian* (Bethurum 130/43–131/49; ‘The visible devil will work many miracles and say that he is God himself, and with his illusions deceive each man; and those whom he may not deceive otherwise, he will compel by force, if he may, so that they renounce God and worship him. If they will not do so, then they will suffer great persecution and miserable death’). Here Wulfstan omits Adso’s references to gifts entirely, places deceitful signs and wonders first, and adds to the list Antichrist’s ultimate lie, that he himself is God.

De temporibus Anticristi, as noted earlier, survives in three manuscripts, two of which – C and E – date from the latter part of the eleventh century, each containing the majority of the homilies identified as Wulfstan’s. The third manuscript, H, was written in the second half of the twelfth century and contains six of Wulfstan’s sermons, three more in Wulfstan’s style, and fifty-four Ælfrician texts. Although this later manuscript contains a large number of Middle English forms and would seem to be the farthest removed from an authorial text, Bethurum relies on it to justify her omission of a lengthy *exemplum*, contained in both of the earlier manuscripts, which tells the story of the conflict between Simon Magus and the apostles Peter and Paul as an illustration of the sort of wonders and crimes Antichrist can be expected to perform and the ways in which the faithful can aspire to resist him. The *exemplum* comprises well over a third of the homily as it appears in the manuscripts, taking up 56 manuscript lines out of a total of 142 in C and 89 manuscript lines out of 245 in E. H gives a truncated version of the sermon, lacking, in addition to the *exemplum*, one sentence preceding it and

⁵⁹ Adso Dervensis, *De ortu et tempore Anticristi*, p. 25.

five following it, picking up again after the omissions with the final three sentences of the homily. Bethurum judges the *exemplum* a scribal interpolation: Wulfstan does not usually include *exempla* in his homilies, and the passage is not composed in Wulfstan's characteristic rhetorical style. She accordingly omits it from her edition as non-authorial.

Not all scholars have agreed with Bethurum's judgment, however. Both Karl Jost and John C. Pope questioned the wisdom of omitting the passage on the grounds of its conceptual and rhetorical integration into the rest of the homily.⁶⁰ If the passage is indeed scribal, it is the work of a singularly skillful scribe; however, even if the passage itself was not composed by Wulfstan – and it is not in any way obvious that it was – there is no reason to suppose that Wulfstan himself did not incorporate the *exemplum* into the sermon without stylistic revision. *Exempla* may not be common in Wulfstan's later work, but neither is allegory, and Wulfstan certainly was responsible for the incorporation of Abbo's allegory on the portents found in Luke 21 into *Secundum Lucam*. The evidence of the two earlier manuscripts, both reliable indicators of Wulfstan's work, would in any case dictate that the passage be considered in any serious study of the homily.

Simon Magus, the magician of Acts 8: 9–24, whose name became synonymous with the sale of church offices – simony – because of his attempt to buy the power of the Holy Spirit from the apostles Peter and John, was regarded in the western church from the fourth century onward as a precursor of Antichrist. The identification stems primarily from Simon's use of magic to deceive the Samaritans so that they esteemed him as a great man, saying *hic est virtus Dei quae vocatur Magna* (Acts 8: 10, 'this [man] is that power of God which is called great'). By the late Anglo-Saxon period in England, however, the story of Simon Magus had grown far beyond its biblical origins: the extended legend makes Simon a sorcerer of Rome allied with the emperor Nero, himself often seen as a type of Antichrist. Simon's demonic magic is pitted against the apostolic miracles of Peter and Paul, and although he loses the contest, Simon's perfidy plays a large part in instigating the apostles' martyrdom at Nero's hands. The story is told in Old English three times: in *De temporibus Anticristi*, in the anonymous Blickling Homily 15,⁶¹ and in Ælfric's *Passio apostolorum Petri et Pauli*.⁶²

Blickling Homily 15, entitled *Spel be Petrus & Paulus* in the manuscript by a hand later than that of the main scribe, is a fairly faithful Old English translation of a large portion of the Pseudo-Marcellus *Passio sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli*.⁶³ The legend is presented, we are told, in order to honor the two apostles as examples of steadfastness in the face of persecution, and it contains little in the way of direct homiletic instruction or exhortation.

⁶⁰ Karl Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, pp. 191–2; John C. Pope, Review of Dorothy Bethurum, *The Homilies of Wulfstan*, *Modern Language Notes* 74 (1959), 338–9.

⁶¹ Morris, *Blickling Homilies*.

⁶² Catholic Homily I.26; Pope, *Homilies of Ælfric*, I, pp. 388–99.

⁶³ Richard Lipsius and Maximilian Bonnet, eds., '*Passio sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli*', *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* (Leipzig: Hermann Mendelsohn, 1901), pp. 120–77.

Simon Magus is depicted throughout as a type of Antichrist who pretends to Christ's power and tries to persuade the Emperor to worship him as God. The homily is organized around a series of three increasingly direct confrontations between the two apostles, primarily Peter, and Simon Magus. In the first, Simon makes 'brass serpents' (*ærene næddran*) that can move and fly in order to impress the populace with his power, while Peter performs actual miracles, healing the sick, casting out devils, and raising the dead.⁶⁴ When the two apostles and Simon are summoned before Nero for the second of their confrontations, Simon transforms himself, first into a young child, then into an old man, as a demonstration of his powers, causing Nero to hail him as the Son of God. The apostles counter with an account of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, and we learn that Simon has attempted to imitate Christ by arranging his own fraudulent execution and then returning from this mock 'death' after three days. But when Peter challenges Simon to prove his divinity by anticipating the apostle's thoughts and actions, Simon fails. Peter has a piece of barley bread⁶⁵ brought to him secretly, blesses and breaks the bread into two pieces, and hides the pieces in his sleeves. Simon, enraged that he cannot guess what Peter is planning to do, summons two huge dogs to attack the apostle; when Peter shows them the bread, the dogs disappear into thin air. The third and final confrontation occurs when Simon has a tower built and leaps from the top in the sight of the assembled populace, having first summoned invisible demons to keep him aloft and prove his divinity once and for all. Paul kneels and prays, and Peter abjures the demons in the name of God to desert Simon. They do, and when Simon falls to his death, he *tobærst on feower dælas*, 'burst asunder into four parts'.⁶⁶ Four stones are then placed where the pieces lay to commemorate the event. Nero holds steadfastly to his error, patiently waiting three days for Simon's resurrection, but when Simon remains dead, he kills the apostles in anger at their deeds.

Ælfric tells much the same story in his *Passio apostolorum Petri et Pauli*, but the Simon Magus narrative comprises only about half of the homily proper. The first part is an explication of Christ's well-known words to Peter in Matthew 16, which Ælfric cites in English: *Ic ðe secge þæt ðu eart stænen. 7 ofer þysne stan ic getimbrie mine cyrcan* (Clemoes 388/12–13, 'I say to you that you are a rock, and on this rock I will build my church'). Eschewing any mention of Christ's pun on Latin *petrus* ('rock'), Ælfric explains that Christ calls Peter a rock because of his faith in Christ, whom the apostle Paul had called a rock;

⁶⁴ Morris, *Blickling Homilies*, pp. 172–3. For a discussion of the role Simon's 'miracles' play as a foil to the true miracles of Peter, see Erhard Dorn, *Der sündige Heilige in der Legende des Mittelalters*, Medium Aevum, Philologische Studien 10 (Munich: Wilhelm Fink 1967), pp. 138–9.

⁶⁵ The origins of Peter's actions here are somewhat obscure. Albert Ferreiro discusses this incident in 'Simon Magus: The Patristic-Medieval Traditions and Historiography', *Apocrypha* 7 (1996), 147–65. On the subject of barley bread as an agent of exorcism, see Sarah Larratt Keefer, 'Ut in omnibus honorificetur Deus: The Corsnæd Ordeal in Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Community, the Family, and the Saint*, ed. Joyce Hill and Mary Swan (Turnhout: Brepols: 1998).

⁶⁶ Morris, *Blickling Homilies*, pp. 188–9.

the true foundation upon which the church is built is thus not Peter, but Christ himself: *Eall godes gelaðung is ofer þam stane gebytlod þæt is ofer criste . . . seo is mid gecorenum mannum getimbrod. na mid deadum stanum . . . Se þe [ne] bytlað of þam grundwealle his weorc hryst to micclum lyre* (Clemoes 390/64–71; 'All of God's church is built on that rock, that is, upon Christ . . . [the foundation] is constructed of chosen men, not of dead rocks . . . He who does [not] build from that foundation, his work falls to great perdition'). Ælfric uses this beginning to set up his narrative as a direct comparison between Simon Peter and Simon Magus. The magician is thus presented in the homily as a sort of anti-apostle rather than Antichrist, and Ælfric carefully selects the material he uses to emphasize the parallel opposition between the two men. He omits the story of Simon Magus's fraudulent death and resurrection with its implicit comparison to Christ and replaces it with two additional confrontations between Peter and Simon, also found in the Pseudo-Marcellus text. In the first, Simon Magus pretends to raise a man from the dead by causing the corpse to move *mid deofles cræft* (392/116, 'through the devil's craft'), and he tells the people to kill Peter, whom he calls a false prophet and *minne wiðerwinnan* (392/114, 'my adversary'). But Peter challenges him: *gif he geedcud sy sprece to us; astande. onbyrige metes 7 ham gecyrre* (392/118–19, 'if he is restored to life, let him speak to us, and stand up; let him taste food, and go back home'). When Simon is unable to accomplish this feat, Peter does so in God's name, and the resurrected man kneels before Peter and proclaims his faith in Christ. The crowd wants to kill Simon, but Peter restrains them: *cwæð ðæt se hælend him tæhte þone regol þæt hi sceoldon yfel mid gode forgyldan* (393/132–4, 'he said that the Savior taught him the rule, that they should repay evil with good'). In the second confrontation, Simon attempts to murder Peter by tying a huge mastiff in his dwelling, which he believes will devour the apostle. But Peter commands the dog to pursue Simon instead, again with the injunction not to harm him, merely to rip his garments to shreds. In each confrontation, Peter appears as much a magician as Simon; the difference lies simply in the source of their respective powers. When at the end of the story Simon falls to his death and breaks into four pieces, Ælfric adds that *ða feower sticcu clifodon to feower stanum þa sind to gewitnysse þæs apostolican siges oð ðysne andweardan dæg* (396/242–397/244, 'the four pieces cleaved to four rocks, which are witnesses of the apostolic victory to this day'). If Simon Peter is the living rock on which Christ builds his church, Simon Magus, having built on the devil's foundation, quite literally *hryst to micclum lyre* ('falls to great perdition') and becomes *dead stan* ('dead stone'). The image of the rocks thus frames Ælfric's implicit contrast between the two men, underscoring the portrayal of Simon Magus as the obverse and anti-type of the apostle.

Ælfric's portrayal of Simon is unusual because, as stated earlier, Simon is most often seen as a type of Antichrist. Both Simon and Antichrist are magicians who claim to be God and attempt to prove their divinity by working signs and wonders. Both are opposed by two holy men sent from God, Simon by Peter and Paul, Antichrist by Enoch and Elias; in each case the magician's opponents defeat his magic but are nonetheless martyred.

Simon dies by falling from a great height at Peter's word; Adso tells us that Antichrist will be killed by the word of God on the Mount of Olives, *in illo loco, contra quem ascendit Dominus ad celum*⁶⁷ ('in the place opposite to where the Lord ascended to heaven'). The Old English translation of Adso (Napier 42) makes the comparison between Christ's ascension from the Mount of Olives and Antichrist's destruction at the same location even more explicit, saying that Antichrist falls '*niðer into helle to ðam ealdan deofle his fæder fram þære stowe, þe he swa modiglice mid woge him geahnode, forðan Crist Godes sunu astah ær þanon up to heofonum to his halgan fæder*' (Napier 201/20–1, 'down into hell to the old devil his father, from that place where he so pridefully and wickedly established himself, because Christ, God's son, rose from there up to heaven to his holy father'). The extended parallel to Simon Magus' attempt to fly and subsequent fall suggests itself almost unavoidably.

Although clearly based on the work of the Pseudo-Marcellus, the *exemplum* found in *De temporibus Anticristi* owes nothing to the Old English translations found in Blickling 15 and Ælfric's homily, and it includes only the first and last of the confrontations between the apostles and Simon. Like the rest of Wulfstan's homily, the *exemplum* focuses on the theme of deceit, and it is therefore introduced by a reference to the deceitful magic (*drycræft*, Napier 98/9) of the Egyptian sorcerers against whose magic Moses worked true miracles and a warning to the faithful to be cautious and mindful (*þæt hi wære beon and þæt hi gemyndige beon*, 98/7–8) of the possibility of such magic. The *exemplum* proper pays greatest attention to Simon's fraudulent assertions of divinity and the signs and wonders he performs to prove them, all of which consist of the creation of false appearances: he makes brass serpents and stone idols that seem to live and move; he transforms himself three times instead of two in his attempt to impress the emperor, first into a child, then into a middle-aged man, and finally into an old man; he appears to fly, but is actually held aloft by demons. By contrast, Peter's miracles transform reality for the better: *gehælde mistlice gebrocode men, blinde and deafe and dumbe and mistlice gelewede* (99/2–4, 'he healed men afflicted in various ways, the blind and deaf and dumb as well as those with other illnesses'). Moreover, Peter's words reveal the truth behind Simon's deceptions when the saint charges the demons helping the magician to fly to abandon him and he falls to his death. The *exemplum* ends with an explicit comparison between Simon Magus and Antichrist, both of whose power stems from *se sylfa deofol* (101/5–6, 'the devil himself').

The inclusion of the *exemplum* thus makes *De temporibus Anticristi* the only Old English work to combine the legend of Antichrist with the story of Simon Magus. The combination provides Wulfstan's homily with a temporal depth and typological sophistication that is not found either in his sources for the Antichrist legend or in the two Old English analogues to the Simon Magus story. By joining the two legends, the homily compels its audience to look backwards and forwards in time simultaneously, back to the deceptions practiced by Simon Magus and forward to those anticipated on the part of

⁶⁷ Adso Dervensis, *De ortu et tempore Anticristi*, p. 29.

Antichrist, thus underscoring the precarious position of human beings in the present, balanced delicately between past dangers and future threats, with only the *god lar* of the homilist as their guide. It also provides two sets of holy men as examples of steadfastness in Christian faith and opposition to the enemy, Peter and Paul against Simon Magus, and Enoch and Elias against Antichrist; the martyrdom of all four reminds the audience that true victory lies in salvation, not in a temporary public triumph over the devil's magic or in physically surviving persecution. Finally, the combination rounds out the lessons of sacred history by assuring the audience that surrounding all, preceding the advent of Simon Magus and following that of the Last Enemy, is Christ, in his first and second comings. If the inclusion of the *exemplum* was not Wulfstan's own work, it was nonetheless an inspired choice.

In what follows Wulfstan returns to Ælfric's *Preface* and its theme of the necessity of teaching the unlearned and correcting their errors, combined with a reiteration of the nearness of the end and the worsening of the world: *hit is nyr þam timan þonne ungelærede men gelyfan willan. and þæt is gesyne þy is ðeos woruld fram dæge to dæge wyrse and wyrse* (Bethurum 132/76–7, 'it is nearer the time than unlearned people would believe, and that is seen in that this world is from day to day worse and worse'). It is tempting to see in this comparison between the knowledge of the learned and the false hopes of the ignorant a covert reference to sabbatical millennialism; once again, however, the ambiguity of the statement makes any certain statement concerning Wulfstan's beliefs as to the exact chronology of the end impossible. Wulfstan does not elaborate on the reference; rather, he returns immediately to the subtle deceptions of Antichrist that will inevitably confuse the minds of the ignorant and unwary: *deofol wyle alces mannes gedanc, gyf he mæg, swyðe gelettan þæt he hit na ne understande, þeah hit him man secge, ne hine wið þæt ne warnige and ðurh þæt wyrð mæst manna beswicen þe hy ne beoð swa wære ne swa wel gewarnode ær swa hy beoðforon* (Bethurum 132/79–83; 'the devil will oppress each person's thoughts, if he may, so that he does not understand, although men tell him, what he is warned against, and in this way most people will be deceived who are not as mindful or as well warned in advance as they need to be'). The homily ends with a prayer that God himself will protect humanity from Antichrist's deceptions and an exhortation to all to earn that protection through moral reformation.

Secundum Marcum, the last of the eschatological sermons *per se*, brings together most of the themes Wulfstan touched on throughout the homiletic series as well as several new biblical and secondary sources, including two by Ælfric: *De die iudicii*⁶⁸ and the revised *Preface* to the *Catholic Homilies*.⁶⁹ It is possible that Wulfstan intended *Secundum Marcum* to be the summation of his thoughts concerning both Antichrist and the Final Days. The sermon is, as noted earlier, the only homily of the six that can be dated from internal evidence. It is appropriate that this sermon alone has a specific temporal

⁶⁸ Pope, *Homilies of Ælfric*, II, pp. 584–5.

⁶⁹ See Godden, 'Millennium', p. 170.

referent, for time, its passing, and the typology of sacred time were very much on Wulfstan's mind in the composition of this homily, which moves repeatedly between comparisons of the past, present, and future.

The opening pericope from Mark 13 comprises a paraphrase of verse 4, an abbreviated quotation from verse 14, and full quotations of verses 17 and 19. Wulfstan translates, at least loosely, all of the verses, but comments explicitly only on 13: 19, which articulates the major theme of the homily: *Erunt enim tribulationes tales quales non fuerunt ab initio creature quam condidit deus usque nunc neque fient, et reliqua* (134/5–7, 'There will be such tribulations as there never were from the beginning of the creation that God created until this time, nor will be, etc.'). For his explication of this quotation, Wulfstan turns to a paraphrase of Paul's prophecy in 2 Timothy 3: 1–5, where the apostle enumerates the sinners and sins who will abound during the Final Days. The time Paul foretold, Wulfstan asserts, has now come, for *nu is se tima þæt ðeos woruld is gemæncged mid mænigfealdan mane and mid felafeadan facne* (135/24–5, 'now is the time that this world is involved with manifold crimes and with many evils'). As an example, Wulfstan returns to a passage from Matthew 24: 12 he had quoted in *Secundum Matheum* without translation or comment: *Quoniam abundabit iniquitas refrigescet caritas multorum*. *Dæt is on englisc, forðam þe unriht weaxeð ealles to wide, soð lufu colað* (135/26–136/29, "'Because iniquity will abound, the love of many will grow cold.'" That is in English, "Because evil grows entirely too widespread, true love cools"). His explication of the passage – possibly influenced by Ælfric's interpretation in *De die iudicii*⁷⁰ – is couched in the present tense and clearly intended as a comment on the present day: *Ne man god ne lufað swa swa man scolde. Ne manna getrywða to ahte ne standað, ac unriht ricsað wide and side, and tealte getrywða syndon mid mannum, and þæt is gesyne on mænigfealde wisan, gecnawe se ðe cunne* (Bethurum 136/29–32; 'No one loves God as a person should. No one remains faithful to anything, but injustice rules far and wide, and loyalty among people is uncertain, and that is seen in many ways, let him know it who can'). If the time Paul was speaking of and Wulfstan's present are equivalent, however, both are to be contrasted to the time of Christ, when there was great happiness (*micel blis*) and ready help from the best of men (*bot seo betste mannum*, Bethurum 136/33). The reminiscence of the past, however, brings a turn of Wulfstan's thought to the advent of Christ's opposite and adversary Antichrist, the worst of all men (*ealra þæra bearna wyrst*, 136/39). The time of Antichrist is in turn equated with the present, for with the loosening of Satan's bonds after 1000 years, Antichrist's advent is well at hand (*wel gehende*, 137/46–7). If anything, the passage of the millennium has intensified Wulfstan's certainty that the Final Days are near: *Men syndon swicole and woruld is þe wyrse, and þæt us dereð eallum. and huru hit sceal hefegian heonanforð pearle rihtwisan þearfan and ðam unbealafullum; nu ða yfelan and ða swicelan swa oferlice swyðe brædað on worulde ongean þæt mæste*

⁷⁰ Cf. Ælfric: *na ealra manna, ac swiðe manegra, þæt hy nateshwón ne lufiað þone lifigendan God, ne hyra nyhstan, ne furðan hy sylfe, for ðon se ðe God ne lufiað, ne lufað he hyne sylfne* ('not all people, but very many, do not love the living God, nor their neighbors, nor further themselves, because he who does not love God does not love himself'). See Pope, *Homilies of Ælfric*, II, 605/334–6.

yfel þe mannum is towerd. Ðæt is se þeodfeond antecrist sylfa (137/47–52; 'People are deceitful, and the world is worse, and that injures us all. And indeed it must henceforth become more oppressive for the righteous and the innocent; now the evil and the deceitful spread widely throughout the world against the coming of the greatest evil that will come to men. That is the archfiend Antichrist himself'). The prospect of Antichrist's persecution of the faithful again turns Wulfstan's thoughts to the past and the persecution of the early Christians, whose suffering was nevertheless not as harsh as the suffering to come, for it was mitigated by the miracles performed by God's saints, which God will not allow during Antichrist's time.

A lengthy description of Antichrist's life and reign follows, derived, like the material in *De temporibus Anticristi*, primarily from Adso, but also showing the influence of Ælfric's revised version of his *Preface* to the *Catholic Homilies*.⁷¹ Wulfstan's statement that Antichrist *bið mennisc man geboren, ac he bið þeah mid deofles gaste eal afylled* (Bethurum 138/66–8, 'will be born a human man, but will be filled entirely with the devil's spirit') reflects Ælfric's assertion that *he bið begyten mid forlire of were and of wife; And he biþ mid deofles gaste afylled* ('he will be begotten through the fornication of a man and a woman; and he will be filled with the devil's spirit'); both formulations are apparently designed to replace the idea, found in *De temporibus Anticristi* and the unrevised *Preface*, that Antichrist is true devil and true man, with its inevitable implication that Antichrist is the devil's son in the same way that Christ is God's son.⁷² Wulfstan then draws on *De temporibus Anticristi* for the points that during Antichrist's reign God will allow him to work false miracles through the devil's power and that those who are not deceived by his lies will be persecuted and tortured, and returns to *De Anticristo* for the prophecy that Antichrist will rule for three and a half years, that Enoch and Elias will be sent by God to preach against him and be martyred, and for the citation from Matthew 10: 21, *Ne byrð þonne broðor oðrum hwilan ne fæder his bearne ne bearn his agenum fæder ne gesibb gesibban þe ma þe fremdan* (140/98–100, 'Brother will not spare brother at that time, nor a father his child, nor a child his own father, nor a kinsman his kinsman any more than a stranger').

What follows is a lengthy set piece enumerating the details of the social chaos that may be expected, as well as the celestial portents Wulfstan discussed at length in *Secundum Lucam*: *Eac sceal aspringan wide and side sacu and clacu, hol and hete and rypera reaflic, here and hunger, bryne and blodgyte and styrrlice styrunga, stric and steorfa and fela unglimpa, and mænigfealde tacna beoð wide gesawene on sunnan and on monan and on mistlican tunglan, and fela cynna egesan geweorþað on eorðan folce to heortgryre and to egeslican fære on mænigfealde wisan* (Bethurum 140/102–141/108; 'Strife and contention will also arise far and wide, and slander and hatred, plunder and rapine, war and hunger, burning and bloodletting and violent disturbances,

⁷¹ The revised text is edited in Peter Clemoes, 'Ælfric's Catholic Homilies, First Series: The Text and Manuscript Tradition' (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1956). On Ælfric's revisions, see Godden, 'Millennium', p. 166, and Emmerson, *Antichrist in the Middle Ages*, p. 151.

⁷² Godden, 'Millennium', p. 166.

plague and pestilence and many other evil events, and many signs will be seen widely in the sun and the moon and in various stars, and many kinds of terror and many sudden dangers will occur on earth to terrify people's hearts'). The language of the full passage is at the least rhythmic and possibly metrical; Bethurum provides an analysis of the rhythm and a possible scansion in her notes to the homily.⁷³ The sermon closes with an exhortation to repentance and a reassurance that those who hold to their faith will have their reward in heaven with God and his saints, where *þær is ece blis and æfre bið in ealra worulda woruld a butan ende* (Bethurum 141/119–20, 'there is eternal happiness and ever will be in the world of all worlds always without end'). The final sentence is, of course, entirely conventional, but it takes on additional resonance in the context of a homily so thoroughly concerned with time past, present, and to come. The *ece blis* that waits for the righteous recalls the *micel blis* invoked by Wulfstan in his reminiscence of Christ's first coming, and thus the homily ends with the implicit reminder that the second coming of Christ will inevitably follow the advent of Antichrist, bringing a final end to the terrors of this world.

Wulfstan invokes the figure of Antichrist several times in his later homilies, but he never again writes a sermon entirely devoted to the subject. It is possible that the passing of the year 1000 had indeed caused him to revise his eschatological expectations; it is more likely, however, that he regarded the final two Antichrist homilies as the culmination of his thoughts on the Final Days. He draws heavily on the eschatological homilies for his conclusion to *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi* (Bethurum VI; Napier 2), a rewriting of Ælfric's *De initio creaturae* that may have been the first homily Wulfstan wrote after finishing *Secundum Marcum*.⁷⁴ Although the ending written for this homily has lost none of the eschatological fervor of the earlier works, the sermon represents a complication and nuancing of Wulfstan's thought concerning the tribulations of the English and the advent of the Final Days, perhaps influenced by his ruminations on time in *Secundum Marcum*. The majority of the homily details the repetitive cycle of sin, punishment, and repentance on the part of the Israelites in Old Testament history, thus implicitly opening the way towards the 'sense of the longer and continuing movement of history' that Godden argues for in his discussion of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*.⁷⁵ As in the later homily, Wulfstan balances an understanding that present historical circumstances may not be based in linear, New Testament thought with an absolute certainty that the apocalypse is imminent. In the earlier sermon, the apparent contradiction may not have bothered him; after all, whether the trials of the English were portents of the end or simply a temporary punishment for sins committed, the remedy was the same – repentance and reform. In the later homily, Wulfstan exploits the tension between the two views of history to greater effect.

⁷³ Bethurum, p. 293n.

⁷⁴ The homily is discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

⁷⁵ Godden, 'Apocalypse and Invasion', p. 152.

Finally, the closing paragraphs of Napier 50, a homily written to be preached before Cnut and the *witan* towards the end of Wulfstan's life, are devoted entirely to eschatological themes. For the most part the conclusion is made up of sentences taken from the Old English version of *De Anticristo*, *De temporibus Anticristi*, and *Secundum Marcum*. There is also, however, a passage that is substantially new within the corpus of Wulfstan's writings that deserves closer examination (Napier 273/3–14):

þeos worold is sorhful 7 fram dæge to dæge a swa leng, swa wyrse. Hwæt, we magon geseon, **hu læne and hu lyðre þis lif is**, hu sarlic 7 hu sorhful 7 hu geswincful 7 hu teonful, hu tealt 7 hu wrað, hu wiðerweard 7 hu swicful. **Heo is þeos woruld on ofstum** 7 on stormum 7 on adlum 7 on ungewyðerum, þæt nu ne beoð naht fela manna ætsamne, þæt heora sum ne si seoc 7 samhal. And, þeah þæt gelimpe, þæt men sume hwile syn her on worolde, swapeah hig beoð aa on geswince 7 mid sorge, forþan **þeos woruld nære wyrðe, þæt man to hire lufe hæfde ealles to swiðe**

This world is sorrowful and from day to day always the longer the worse. Indeed, we may see how transitory and how corrupt this life is, how painful and how sorrowful and how toilsome and how evil, how precarious and how cruel, how perverse and how deceitful. This world is in haste and in storm and in sickness and in foul weather, so that now there cannot be many people together of whom certain ones are not sick and weak. And although it may happen that people will remain here in the world for a certain while, nevertheless they will be always in toil and in sorrow, because this world is not worthy that a person love it all too much.

The phrases in boldface indicate parts of the passage that Jost was able to source directly: each has a parallel in the 'Wulfstanized' conclusion of *In die iudicii* (Napier 40) as it occurs in three of the text's four manuscripts – C, E, and N – but not in the conclusion that appears in B, where the ending is made up at least in part by the concluding passages of *De septiformi spiritu*. In his study of the dissemination of Wulfstan's homilies, Jonathan Wilcox describes the ending of *In die iudicii* in these three manuscripts as comprising 'short, rather obvious and somewhat approximate borrowings from Wulfstan's homilies', and he suggests that the compiler composed it from memory rather than from citations out of specific texts.⁷⁶ The relevant passage from *In die iudicii* (with parallel passages again in boldface) reads as follows (Napier 189/3–9):

Uton gecnawan, **hu læne and hu lyðre þis lif is** on to getruwianne, and hu oft hit wurð raðost forloren and forlæten, þonne hit wære leofost gehealden. **Deos woruld is sorhful and fram dæge to dæge a swa leng swa wyrse, forþam ðe heo is on ofstum**, and hit nealæcð þam ende, and **þi heo wære wurðe, þæt hig ænig man ne lufode ealles to swiðe**

Let us recognize how transitory and how wretched this life is to trust in, and how often it is most quickly lost and abandoned when it is held dearest. This world is sorrowful and from day to day always the longer the worse, because it is in haste and nears its end, and it is worthy that no person love it at all too much.

Jost points out that the phrases from *In die iudicii* that Wulfstan uses in Napier

⁷⁶ Wilcox, 'Dissemination', p. 206.

50 have, for the most part, 'die Wulfstanschen Sprachcharakter',⁷⁷ even though they are not used in precisely the same way elsewhere in Wulfstan's extant works: for example, the thoroughly Wulfstanian *fram dæge to dæge a swa leng swa wyrse* is used in conjunction with *sorhful* only in these two passages, and Wulfstan's other uses of 'this world is in haste' have *ofste* rather than *ofstum*. In addition, Wilcox, following Jost, notes that the words *hu læne* and *hu lyðre þis lif is on to getruwianne*, and *hu oft hit wurð raðost forloren and forlæten*, þonne hit wære leofost gehealden are also closely related to a passage from Wulfstan's *Sermo ad populum* (Bethurum XIII, the Pastoral Letter): *Eala, lytel is se fyrst þyses lifes, and lyðre is, þæt we lufiað and on wuniað, and for oft hit wyrð raðost forloren þonne hit wære leofost healdan* (Bethurum 226/12–14, 'Alas, short and wretched is the time of this life that we love and inhabit, and often it is most quickly lost when it is held dearest').⁷⁸ Nevertheless, the exact correspondences between *In die iudicii* and Napier 50 – that is, the word *sorhful* in its phrase and *ofstum* instead of *ofste* in its, as well as the two clauses *hu læne and hu lyðre þis lif is* and *þeos woruld nære wyrðe, þæt man to hire lufe hæfde ealles to swiðe* – do not appear verbatim in any extant Wulfstan text, and this could suggest that both the Wulfstanizing compiler of the end of *In die iudicii* and Wulfstan himself in Napier 50 were citing from memory a now lost Wulfstan homily that contained the parallel phrasing.

More problematic, however, is the list of adjectives following *hu læne and hu lyðre* in Napier 50, which clearly contains non-Wulfstanian vocabulary. As Jost points out, five of the eight adjectives – *geswincful*, *teonful*, *wrað*, *wiðerweard*, and *swicful* – are otherwise unattested in the Wulfstan canon.⁷⁹ Because so much of the rest of the homily is made up, like other 'Wulfstanized' but non-authorial sermons, of a patchwork of citations and Wulfstanian references, Jost regards this sentence as evidence that the homily is the work of a compiler who carefully combined phrases and sentences from Wulfstan's work to compose the sermon. However, if the sentence is a quotation, it is not the only unrevised quotation within the sermon: Wulfstan quotes Ælfric's pastoral letters several times without revision in the part of the homily devoted to clerical celibacy. Bethurum, although she does not comment specifically on the non-Wulfstanian adjectives, does suggest that the unrevised quotations from Ælfric, rather than casting doubt on Wulfstan's authorship of the sermon, instead raise the possibility that 'the occasion for which Wulfstan assembled this document dictated haste'.⁸⁰ If she is correct, there is no reason why Wulfstan could not have left a quotation from another source unrevised. To think otherwise is to leave ourselves back with Jost's painstaking compiler, laboriously interweaving a word from one text with a phrase from another, and perhaps two or three words from a third – an unlikely possibility at best. It is more likely that the phrase containing the

⁷⁷ Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, p. 257: 'the Wulfstanian linguistic character'.

⁷⁸ Wilcox, 'Napier's 'Wulfstan' Homilies XL and XLII: Two Anonymous Works from Winchester?' *Journal of English and German Philology* 90 (1991), p. 7.

⁷⁹ Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, p. 257.

⁸⁰ Bethurum, p. 40.

unsourced adjectives is not a quotation at all, for the sentence as a whole is thoroughly Wulfstanian in its alliteration and rhythm.

The new vocabulary may signal instead a new development in Wulfstan's eschatology, manifested primarily in a change in tone and emphasis from the archbishop's previous sermons. Certainly Wulfstan's lamentation for the pain and sorrow and toil of the world at the end of Napier 50 evokes a feeling quite different from that produced in the early eschatological homilies by his emphasis on the terror and persecutions that will come with the age of Antichrist or by his thundering condemnation of the sins and crimes of the present day in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. The shift in emphasis stems, I believe, from two sources: first, an extended view of history that Wulfstan gained from the end of the Danish invasions, and second, from the archbishop's consciousness of his own advancing age and, perhaps, frailty.

Wulfstan's longer view of history is demonstrated in part by his admission that *þæt gelimpe þæt men sume hwile syn her on worolde* (Napier 273/11–12, 'it may happen, that people will remain here in the world for a certain time'). This idea does have precedent in the Old English version of *De Anticristo*, where Wulfstan acknowledges that *fela manna Antecrist sylfne næfre his eagum ne geseo* (Bethurum 116/12–13, 'many people will never see Antichrist with their own eyes'); in the same homily he prefaces his demand that the clergy admonish the faithful about the end of the world on a regular basis by conceding *þæt geweorðe þæt ure ænig þe nu leofað þonne ne libbe* (118/30–1, 'that it may happen that none who are now alive will be alive then'). But as the series of eschatological homilies progressed, Wulfstan became increasingly convinced that the age of Antichrist was in fact immediately at hand, even suggesting in *Secundum Marcum*, that it had already begun. Yet whereas in *De Anticristo* the idea that the end might not come during the lifetimes of those present is combined with a clear statement that *sy þam timan swyðe gehende* (117/22–3, 'the time may be very near at hand'), in Napier 50 it is coupled instead with the prediction that people's lives will continue to be lived *aa on geswince 7 mid sorge* (Napier 273/12–13, 'always in toil and with sorrow'). Clearly, while Wulfstan has no doubt of the coming apocalypse, he no longer believes it to be as imminent as he had at the beginning of his career.

The passage also contains Wulfstan's most specific and extended treatment of the classical and patristic idea that as time passes and the end of the world comes closer, human beings deteriorate, for as the macrocosm of the world ages and becomes weak, so too does the microcosm of the human being:⁸¹ *Heo is þeos woruld on ofstum 7 on stormum 7 on adlum 7 on ungewyðderum, þæt nu ne beoð naht fela manna ætsamne, þæt heora sum ne si seoc 7 samhal* (273/8–10, 'This world is in haste and in storm and in sickness and in foul weather, so that now there cannot be many people together of whom certain ones are not sick and weak'). Although once again this idea is not entirely new to Wulfstan's

⁸¹ For an extended discussion of this theme, see J. E. Cross, 'Aspects of Microcosm and Macrocosm in Old English Literature', in *Studies in Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur*, ed. Stanley B. Greenfield (Eugene, OR: University of Oregon Books, 1963), pp. 1–22.

work – he makes reference to the theme in *Secundum Marcum* when he substitutes the word *wacre* ('weaker'), for his more usual *wyrse* in the phrase *hit is on worulde a swa leng swa wacre* (Bethurum 137/47, 'it is in the world always the longer the weaker')⁸² – here it seems to indicate that Wulfstan has come to envision a long, slow process of degeneration preceding the still-inevitable end. It may be relevant that Wulfstan's own life would end within a few short years of the composition of this homily, for his tone betrays a weariness with the world and its troubles, an omnipresent awareness of human frailty and of the spiritual and physical hardships of life on earth in what he fully believed to be its last age. When he concludes with his usual reminder that no one can possibly say how evil the world will become at the end (*Nis se man on life, þe mæge oððe cunne swa yfel hit asecgan. swa hit sceal gewurðan on þam deoflican timan*, Napier 273/30–2, 'No living person can know or speak of how evil it will become in that devilish time'), the line seems less conventional than heartfelt. His eschatological expectations have not lessened, nor has his insistence that only prior warnings, present repentance, and finally the direct intervention of God can protect human beings against the wiles of Antichrist. But the aging archbishop of Napier 50 is no longer the firebrand preacher of Bethurum homilies Ia to V. Although the body of the homily contains his hopes for the social reconstruction of England governed by the laws that he had written, its conclusion expresses his unshakable conviction of that society's end. But one wonders if, in writing Napier 50, Wulfstan believed that he would live long enough to see either his societal hopes or his eschatological expectations fulfilled.

⁸² Ibid., p. 5. The same idea may underlie another passage in *Secundum Lucam*, where Wulfstan writes that *clæne wæs þeos eorðe on hyre frumsceafte* (Bethurum 124/27, 'this earth was pure at its creation'), and proceeds to talk about how the earth has since been increasingly befouled by human sin, so that all of nature wars against humanity, sending *stormas* that *æceras swyðe amyrræð* (125/39–40, 'storms' that 'destroy the fields totally'). Compare the description of the world as *on stormum* both in the passage from Napier 50 cited above and in an earlier passage taken from the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, where Wulfstan argues that because of the people's sins, *unwederu for oft weoldon unwæstma* (Bethurum 269/59, 'foul weather has often produced failed crops').

Salvation History and Christianity

WHEN WULFSTAN became bishop of London in 996 and later archbishop of York and Worcester in 1002, he took on the powers and responsibilities that the church had assigned to bishops since late antiquity: the *potestas ordinis*, the power to administer the sacraments reserved for bishops and archbishops – confirmation and the ordination of priests – as well as the power to consecrate new bishops and to dedicate churches, altars, and chrism; the *potestas jurisdictionis*, the power to legislate for and dispense justice to those within his sees; and the *potestas magisterii*, the power to instruct both the clergy and laity.¹ The second of these may have provided the most practical venue for societal reform; however, the third would likely have seemed the most immediately important,² especially in the large and remote archdiocese of York, which was arguably the poorest and least educated part of the country. The north had barely been touched by the tenth-century monastic reform movement, and despite its geographical magnitude, at the time of Wulfstan's accession the province could boast only two large ecclesiastical centers, at York and Durham. In addition, the area had a sizeable Anglo-Scandinavian population made up of the descendants of late-ninth- and early-tenth-century settlers, who by Wulfstan's time had been converted to Christianity, but who were not, perhaps, as thoroughly instructed in the faith as the archbishop would have wished them to be, and who may have engaged in a syncretic mix of Christian and pagan practices.³ There would also have been relatively recent immigrants among them, primarily Danish merchants, some of whom may have continued to practice the religion of their ancestors, even though Denmark had been officially Christian for a good generation. As archbishop, Wulfstan would have been concerned to mold this

¹ Frank Barlow, *The English Church 1000–1066* (2nd edn, London and New York: Longman, 1979), p. 243.

² Wulfstan was not alone in his concern: C. P. Wormald states that 'The truth is that Ælfric and his contemporaries were overwhelmingly concerned with the education of the clergy'; see 'The Uses of Literacy in Anglo-Saxon England and its Neighbours', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser. 27 (1977), 95–114, at p. 109.

³ Lesley Abrams, 'The Conversion of the Danelaw', *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress, Nottingham and York, 21–30 August 1997*, ed. James Graham-Campbell, Richard Hall, Judith Jesch, and David N. Parsons (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001), pp. 31–44, at p. 31. See also Judith Jesch, 'Scandinavians and "Cultural Paganism" in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England: Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching*, ed. Paul Cavill (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2004), pp. 55–68.

constituency into a single Christian community united not only by a common faith, but also by common ritual practices and moral behavior.

During his final years as bishop of London and the first decade of his tenure as archbishop of York,⁴ Wulfstan wrote a series of homilies designed to teach the rudiments of the Christian religion to the two principal segments of the population within his sees: the Catholic laity, both English and Danish, and the secular priests, some of whom might themselves have needed basic theological instruction in English, but all of whom could appropriate Wulfstan's vernacular sermons for their own use. Although it would have been necessary for a bishop to provide spiritual education to the faithful in any part of England,⁵ Wulfstan's well-known predilection in his homilies for straightforward exposition of Christianity combined with moral exhortation may have been dictated as much by the illiteracy and ignorance he found in the north as by his personal temperament.⁶ Of course, the precise level of learning in early-eleventh-century York – and Anglo-Saxon England as a whole – is difficult to determine. Formal education was the province of the clergy and the aristocracy and was carried out for the most part in Latin; for the unlettered masses, as Clare Lees notes, 'the only institutional provision for vernacular education and the only conceptualization of its necessity occurs within the vernacular homilies'⁷ themselves. The ultimate goal of such homiletic education was knowledge of God and the means of salvation; at minimum, the preacher's aim would have been to teach his congregation to know and understand the two most important Christian texts, the Pater Noster and Creed.

Among the clergy, the education of priests was never as systematic as that of monks: although most priests would have received instruction at minsters, and some monasteries would have provided education for a limited number of boys who were not oblates, others, especially those in rural areas, would have been taught informally by whoever was available among the local clergy⁸ – a system that inevitably produced discrepancies in the level of education that could be expected from individual priests and thus the quality of pastoral care they provided. It was Wulfstan's responsibility as bishop and archbishop to take steps to remedy the situation, and his major efforts in this regard were characteristically legislative, resulting in two collections of canon law that served the dual purpose of providing codification of the standards of clerical life and offering teaching tools for ordinands and newly ordained priests:

⁴ Bethurum dates homilies VI–VII (*Incipiunt sermones Lupi Episcopi* and *De fide catholica*) to 'the period before 1008', and places the other catechetical homilies more generally in 'the early years of his incumbency', p. 103.

⁵ For the extent of 'heathen' superstitious practices in England outside the Danelaw, see Audrey L. Meaney, "'And we forbeodað eornostlice ælcne hæðenscipe": Wulfstan and Late Anglo-Saxon and Norse "Heathenism"', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 461–500.

⁶ Cf. Bethurum, who states (p. 103), 'Perhaps the illiteracy and paganism at York made necessary Wulfstan's concentration on the essential core of Christian teaching; perhaps he was merely carrying out in his practical, realistic way the reforms instituted under Dunstan, Ethelwold, and Oswald'.

⁷ Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, p. 110.

⁸ Barlow, *The English Church*, pp. 277–8.

the *Canons of Edgar* and the *Excerptiones (Pseudo-)Ecgberhti*.⁹ In addition, as Christopher A. Jones has pointed out, some of the paraliturgical texts found in the 'commonplace book' manuscripts would be 'appropriate for basic instruction of the clergy',¹⁰ particularly the expositions of the mass found within *De officio missae* (extant in Cop, W, X, and Bar) and *Expositio officium sacrae missae* (in W); the explanations of the church year contained in the latter text as well as in the *Institutio beati Amalarii de ecclesiasticis officiis* (in W and R); and the so-called 'Old English Benedictine Office' (in C, G, and in part in Bar, W, X, and Cambridge, Pembroke College, 25).¹¹ Finally, three homiletic passages interpolated into the *Institutes of Polity* in G¹² speak directly on the question of the education of the secular clergy and the ways in which they are to live.

The earliest of these three texts, printed by Jost as Appendix I of *Polity*, addresses priests living as part of a community of canons attached to a cathedral and comprises Wulfstan's translation of chapter 45 of Amalarius of Metz's *De regula canonicorum*. Bethurum prints the text as homily Xa, but, as Jonathan Wilcox has pointed out, as it stands the work is not in fact structured as a sermon.¹³ Wulfstan most likely translated the work in preparation for writing the *Canons of Edgar* or for composing a more formal homily for canons; phrases from the translation recur in Wulfstan's legal codes as well as in later homilies addressed both to the clergy and the laity.¹⁴ *De regula canonicorum* covers almost all facets of the canons' life in brief, emphasizing the communal nature of their vocation, warning them against greater and lesser sins, and enjoining brotherhood and celibacy. Literacy is assumed in the requirement to *rædon gelome halige bec* (Bethurum 192/26, 'read holy books often'); however, the education of the priests is addressed only generally in the injunctions that the older canons should *lufian 7 læran georne heora gingran* (Bethurum 193/44, 'love and earnestly teach their younger [brothers]') and that the learned among them *Ne forseon . . . ða ungelæredan, ac læran hi georne* (Bethurum 193/45–6, 'not neglect . . . the unlearned, but teach them eagerly').

Wulfstan is more specific in the second text, which is rubricated in the manuscript *Be gehadedum mannun* and printed by Jost as Appendix F. *Be gehadedum mannun* sets out standards for what candidates for the priesthood should know and outlines a system, based on Carolingian models,¹⁵

⁹ Roger Fowler, ed., *Wulfstan's Canons of Edgar*, EETS 266 (London: Oxford University Press, 1972); J. E. Cross and Andrew Hamer, eds., *Wulfstan's Canon Law Collection* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1999).

¹⁰ Christopher A. Jones, 'Wulfstan's Liturgical Interests', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 325–52, at p. 332.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 332–3; 351–2.

¹² Jost, *Polity*, pp. 217–23.

¹³ Wilcox, 'Dissemination', p. 201n, dismisses the text as 'non-homiletic'. See my discussion of Jost's Appendix I in Chapter 2.

¹⁴ Bethurum, p. 322n. She gives the example of the list of sinners found also in Wulfstan's *Sermo de baptisate* and elsewhere.

¹⁵ Susan A. Keefe notes that 'decrees since the time of Boniface demanded that priests be examined before ordination and annually by their bishop or bishop's representative'. See *Water and the Word: Baptism and the Education of the Clergy in the Carolingian Empire* (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), pp. 14–15. See also E. Vykoukal, 'Les examens du clergé paroissial à l'époque carolingienne', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 14 (1913), 81–96.

whereby each candidate would present himself to the bishop one month prior to ordination for instruction (if necessary), and an examination on the basic tenets of Christianity and the duties of a priest. The candidate would be questioned first about his understanding of his faith and how well he is able to communicate it to others; then about the course of salvation history, baptism, the mass, and other church services; and finally about his knowledge of canon law and computus. Wulfstan's questions are similar to the *interrogationes sacerdotales* and lists of what every priest must know that are found in Carolingian capitularies: these typically include an exposition of the faith and salvation history requiring knowledge of the Pater Noster, the Creed, and the psalter; the liturgy of the mass and baptismal services; the clerical grades, the eight capital sins and their remedies, canon law, the penitential, the calendar, and computus.¹⁶

In the same passage, however, Wulfstan acknowledges that it is sometimes necessary to ordain half-educated (*samlæredne*) priests, but he adds that this should only be done on condition that the priest in question solemnly pledge to learn what he needs to know and be examined again by the bishop at a later time.¹⁷ This would seem to confirm Jones's speculation that the periodic examinations of ordained priests mandated by the Council of Clofesho in 747 had not outlasted the ninth century,¹⁸ for if such examinations were common practice, no such pledge would have been necessary. The passage also underscores the necessity of reading all such texts as prescriptive rather than descriptive; it is possible that here Wulfstan is trying to reinstitute a practice that had fallen into disuse rather than standardizing existing practice,¹⁹ and he finds it necessary to recognize the practical realities of doing so.

Most importantly, Wulfstan's concession regarding the ordination of candidates who are not fully educated points to a pressing need for priests that corresponds to the widespread proliferation of Anglo-Saxon churches in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries.²⁰ Most of the churches built during this period would have been proprietary churches on manorial estates, whether ecclesiastical or lay; others would have originated 'through devolution from minsters, or through corporate initiative'.²¹ The sheer numbers of the new churches resulted in a new division in the hierarchy of secular ecclesiastical foundations: whereas II Edgar 1–2.2 had specified only three types of churches (old minsters, smaller churches with graveyards, and

¹⁶ Keefe, *Water and the Word*, pp. 15ff.

¹⁷ Jost, *Polity*, p. 221.

¹⁸ Jones, 'Wulfstan's Liturgical Interests', p. 333. See also Catherine Cubitt, *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils, c.650–c.850* (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1995), pp. 99–100 and 123.

¹⁹ Still, to characterize Wulfstan's prescriptions as 'wishful thinking' seems somewhat extreme: John Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 361.

²⁰ For a detailed analysis of the proliferation of small churches during the tenth and eleventh centuries, see *ibid.*, pp. 368–93.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8. See also Ann Williams, *Æthelred the Unready: The Ill-Counselled King* (London and New York: Hambledon and London, 2003), pp. 38–9; and D. M. Hadley, *The Northern Danelaw: Its Social Structure, c.800–1100* (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 2000), pp. 38–9, 89.

smaller churches without graveyards), VII Æthelred 5.1 and I Cnut 3.2 refer to four: *heafodmynstres* ('chief minsters'), *medemran mynsteres* (medium-sized minsters), *þonne git laessan* ('those yet smaller', i.e., without graveyards), and *feldcirca* ('field-churches').²² The newly established churches must have required a large number of priests to serve them, and Wulfstan's comment may be read as an admission that the demand had outstripped the supply.

The third text, *De ecclesiasticis gradibus*, is printed as Jost's Appendix G and is found joined to a non-Wulfstanian text in G; however, it also appears as a self-contained work in C and W. The text sets out the seven grades of clerical office²³ – one of the subjects priests were required to know in the Carolingian capitularies – and explains how Christ symbolically performed the duties of each grade during his lifetime: for example, he acted as an exorcist when he drove out devils, as a subdeacon when he changed the water to wine, as a deacon when he fed the multitudes, and as a priest at the Last Supper. In the opening paragraph Wulfstan sets forth a number of additional prerequisites for clerical office: the candidate must be free of mortal sin, and if he is not, he must confess and atone for such sins before ordination; he must know and understand the duties of his office; he must have made peace with any person who is angry with him; he must fast, pray, and make confession; and finally, he must live his life thenceforth in chastity and according to the rule.

However, texts such as these, written by a member of the secular clergy, are rare. Most of the sources for ecclesiastical culture that have come down to us are monastic in origin, and the lenses through which they view the conditions within the secular church are often biased toward the monastic as opposed to the secular life. One must therefore approach contemporary descriptions of the secular clergy with all due caution, even when the source is as prestigious and generally reliable as Ælfric of Eynsham. In the years immediately before and after Wulfstan's accession to the archbishopric, Ælfric wrote a series of pastoral letters admonishing and advising the secular clergy, including two in Latin addressed to Wulfstan that were subsequently translated into English at Wulfstan's request, and one in English addressed to Bishop Wulfsig of Sherborne.²⁴ Ælfric's letter to Wulfsig may be dated to the years of the latter's tenure as bishop, that is, between 992 and 1002;²⁵ the

²² John Blair, 'Debate: Ecclesiastical Organization and Pastoral Care in Anglo-Saxon England', *Early Medieval Europe* 4 (1995), 193–212, at p. 200. Karen Jolly suggests that *feldcirca* may not have been churches in the modern sense of the term, but rather small chapels with no resident priest, or even places marked for devotion by a stone cross. See her *Popular Religion in Late Saxon England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p. 59.

²³ The seven are listed as *Hostiarius*, *Lector*, *Exorcista*, *Accolitus*, *Subdiaconus*, *Diaconus*, and *Presbiter*.

²⁴ All five letters are edited by Bernhard Fehr, *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 9 (Hamburg: H. Grand, 1914), reprinted with a supplementary introduction by P. A. M. Clemoes (Darmstadt, 1964). The letter to Wulfsig is Fehr I; the Latin letters to Wulfstan are Fehr 2 and 3; the Old English translations are Fehr II and III.

²⁵ Peter Clemoes, 'The Chronology of Ælfric's Works', in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of their History and Culture Presented to Bruce Dickinson*, ed. P. A. M. Clemoes (London, 1959), pp. 212–47; repr. in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (New York: Garland, 2000), pp. 29–72, at p. 56. Joyce Hill, however, points out the possibility that Wulfsig became bishop in 993 and died earlier than 1002, thus narrowing the possible range of dates. See her 'Monastic Reform and the Secular Church: Ælfric's Pastoral Letters in Context', in

Latin letters for Wulfstan were most likely written in 1005, with the English translations made in 1006.²⁶ Their purpose, as stated in Ælfric's Latin preface to Wulfstan's letter, was to point out the negligence (*negligentium*) of the secular clergy, warning that *pene statuta canonum et sancte aeclesiae religio vel doctrina eorum perversitate deleta sunt*²⁷ ('canon law and the religion and doctrine of the holy church have nearly been destroyed by their perversity'). In his Latin preface to Wulfstan's Old English letters, Ælfric further expresses his hope that he might *quibusdam prodesse ad correctionem*²⁸ ('contribute to the correction of some people'). Given Ælfric's stated intentions, one might expect the letters to paint an unremittingly grim picture of the secular clergy.

In fact, as Joyce Hill points out, the picture Ælfric paints is contradictory: 'on the one hand a regular life [for the secular clergy] is assumed with some competence in liturgy and Latin; on the other these assumptions are belied by the habits described and by the equally clear suppositions that the clergy are not competent, not well educated and . . . cannot understand Latin'.²⁹ If Ælfric admonishes priests for drunkenness, inappropriate behavior in church, and breaches of chastity; for allowing the communion wafers to mold and be eaten by mice; and even for allowing the altar to be fouled by mouse droppings and other filth, he also expects priests to own an impressive and expensive array of books,³⁰ and to know or have access to the antiphons he refers to by Latin tags in complicated liturgical instructions. Such contradictions make it difficult to take his letters at face value. In particular, the extent to which late Anglo-Saxon priests could understand Latin requires further comment.

In his *Preface to the Grammar*, Ælfric writes that the previous generation of priests was thoroughly illiterate in Latin: *nan Englisc preost ne cuðe dihtan oððe asmeagean anne pistol on Leden*³¹ ('no English priest knew how to compose or interpret a letter in Latin'). As Robert Stanton points out, however, here Ælfric is almost certainly echoing Alfred's similar complaint in the *Preface to Pastoral Care*, and the rhetorical force of the assertion is therefore to 'honour . . . Alfred's paradigm of decay and revival as part of [Ælfric's] praise for the Benedictine revivers who were also his teachers'.³² Still, Ælfric apparently believed that the reform had effected an improvement, for in the first Old English letter to Wulfstan his assessment is not quite as dire: *Vs bisceopum*

England in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1992), pp. 103–17, at p. 103n.

²⁶ Clemoes, 'Chronology', pp. 55–7, 98n.

²⁷ Jonathan Wilcox, ed., *Ælfric's Prefaces*, Durham Medieval Texts (Durham: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1994; corr. repr. 1996), p. 123. The translation is Wilcox's, p. 133.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 126; translation, p. 134.

²⁹ Hill, 'Monastic Reform', p. 110.

³⁰ These include, in Ælfric's first Old English letter to Wulfstan, a *mæsseboc* and *pistelboc*, and *sangboc* and *rædingboc* and *saltere* and *handboc*, and *penitentialem* and *gerim* ('a mass-book and epistle book, and a songbook and a reading-book and a psalter and handbook, and a penitential and computus'). The letter to Wulfstan adds a *godspellboc* ('gospel-book') and *passionalem* ('passional'). See Fehr, *Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, pp. 126, 13.

³¹ Preface to the *Grammar*; Wilcox, *Prefaces*, p. 116.

³² Robert Stanton, *The Culture of Translation in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2002), p. 116n.

*gedafenæð, þæt we þa boclican lare þe ure canon us tæcð and eac seo Cristes boc, eow preostum geopenigen on engliscum gereorde; forþam þe ge ealle ne cunnon þæt leden understandan*³³ ('It is fitting for us bishops, that we open to you priests in the English language the written doctrine that our canons and also Christ's book teach us; because you do not all understand Latin'). The fact that Wulfstan found it necessary to write most of his homilies addressed to the clergy in English – as well as to request Ælfric to translate the Latin letters – would suggest that this more moderate assertion is the truth: not all priests understood Latin, and pastoral instructions, biblical exegesis, and other religious educational materials must therefore be translated for them.

Hill likewise observes that monastic descriptions of clerical faults 'need not always derive from direct observation, since they point to a written tradition of ecclesiastical reform with which Wulfsgie and Wulfstan wished to ally themselves',³⁴ noting further that in addition to Ælfric's practical purposes in writing the letters, the texts also perform the rhetorical function of 'defining the bishops' position as authority figures who wished to establish standards and who saw the secular church contrastively'.³⁵ Hill's points are well taken, yet one must also bear in mind that Ælfric was writing about and for a mixed audience that included not only communities of well-educated clerics in established and well-equipped minsters who could make use of liturgical descriptions calling for complex interactions among the celebrants at mass, but also priests belonging to the lesser proprietary churches, as well as the isolated, often under-educated priests struggling to survive in the tiny single-cell field churches of impoverished rural areas. The contrasts are particularly striking in the second Old English letter to Wulfstan. Ælfric's instructions for the celebration of services from Maundy Thursday through Easter Sunday assume a community of brothers, a lay congregation, and at least two celebrants at mass (a deacon and a masspriest), and it is upon this section of the letter that the knowledge of Latin (and Greek) antiphons is predicated. But Ælfric also has words for the priest who has no assistants, telling him to instruct boys and young men who will then be able to follow in his footsteps to the priesthood (*ge sceolan læran cnapan and geonge men eow to fultume, þæt hig æfter eow don þa ylcan þenunga*).³⁶ It is most likely these solitary clerics who would need Ælfric's advice about what to do if the available wine is insufficient for services throughout the year, who would entertain superstitious beliefs about the particular sanctity of hosts consecrated during holy week, and who would therefore keep those hosts in reserve until they molded. The same sort of mixed audience must be presumed for the matters of faith in which Ælfric chooses to instruct the clergy (in the second Old English letter these are the ten commandments along with the eight capital sins and their remedies): both 'half-educated' priests who would need instruction in such basic tenets themselves, and the well-educated who would use the letter as

³³ Fehr, *Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, p. 68.

³⁴ Hill, 'Monastic Reform', p. 111.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Fehr, *Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, pp. 174–6.

a homiletic model for instructing the faithful. Wulfstan's sermons on salvation history, the Pater Noster, and the Creed, addressed to the same mixed audience, would have served similarly mixed purposes.

It is possible that Wulfstan intended his homilies to comprise a book-length collection on the order of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*. Certainly the rubric attached to Bethurum homily VI (Napier 2) in three of its four manuscripts, *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi* ('Here begin the sermons of Bishop Wolf'), suggests that the text is the first of a number of related sermons – and it may be no accident that the sermon itself is based on the first homily of Ælfric's collection, *De initio creaturae*.³⁷ However, any such collection has not survived intact. Although in the three eleventh-century manuscripts bearing the full rubric (B, C, and E) the homily is followed immediately by a second catechetical homily, Wulfstan's *De fide catholica* (Bethurum VII; Napier 3), and although in E *De fide catholica* is given the numeral 'II.' in the margin next to its rubric, the resemblance among the manuscripts ends there. B continues with a version of *De die iudicii* (Napier 40), a 'Wulfstanized' but non-Wulfstanian homily on the Day of Judgment based on Vercelli Homily 2; C continues with Wulfstan's Pastoral Letter (Bethurum XIII; Napier 19–26), while E proceeds to yet a different homily, Wulfstan's *Sermo de baptisate* (Bethurum VIIIc; Napier 5). In H, the text bears the truncated rubric *SERMONES* and follows a version of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, but is otherwise disconnected from the other Wulfstan texts within the manuscript.

Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi provides a brief overview of salvation history from the creation to the judgment that is in large part a rewriting of Ælfric's *De initio creaturae*, with additional material taken from a tract by Abbot Pirmin of Reichenau entitled *Dicta abbatis Pirmi*.³⁸ The sermon is related in both structure and content to Wulfstan's *De fide catholica* (Bethurum VII; Napier 3), a homily that also makes use of Ælfric's sermon and is likewise structurally and thematically related to yet a third text comprising Wulfstan's translations of the Pater Noster and Creed (Bethurum VIIa; Napier 26). The three sermons form a distinct grouping within the homilies as a whole and were probably composed at roughly the same time. But although *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi* and *De fide catholica* are associated with each other in three manuscripts, the manuscript associations of the translation are instead with Wulfstan's Pastoral Letter, which follows *De fide catholica* only in C.

Wulfstan's rewriting of Ælfric's *De initio creaturae* differs from its source in its intended audience, its emphasis, and its length. Whereas Ælfric does not specify a particular audience for *De initio creaturae*, Wulfstan addresses *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi* to the clergy in an introductory passage drawn from Pirmin: citing Isaiah 58: 1 on the necessity of preaching God's word, he warns his audience in a paraphrase of Ezekiel 33: 7–9 that they will be required to render an account to God on the Day of Judgment for

³⁷ For Ælfric, see Peter Clemoes, ed., *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series*, EETS ss 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 178–89. Hereafter cited in the text by page and line number.

³⁸ Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, pp. 55–61.

all the condemned souls whose sins could have been avoided but for their priests' negligence: *scealt þu ealra þæra sawla on domesdæg gescead agyldan þe þurh þæt losiað* (Bethurum 142/12–143/13, 'you must be guilty for all the souls who are lost through that on judgment day').³⁹ Whereas Ælfric's text clearly reveals what Clare Lees has called his 'distinctive aesthetic of beginnings',⁴⁰ Wulfstan's aesthetic is by contrast one of endings: his homily is a chronicle of transgression and punishment leading inexorably to the terrors of Antichrist's reign at the end of the world and the certain punishment of sinners that will follow.⁴¹ Both texts, however, act to focus the attention of their audiences not solely on the biblical past, but on the English present: salvation history is important to both Wulfstan and Ælfric because it provides through example guidelines for contemporary Christian behavior; it offers a point of entry for the Anglo-Saxons into Christian world history; and thus, in Clare Lees's words, it provides a means of 'returning to God'.⁴²

Wulfstan condenses Ælfric's text by half, mostly through the omission of the latter's copious narrative detail. Ælfric's extended account of the creation and fall of the angels is cut to a single paragraph focusing on Lucifer's disobedience and punishment; it is followed by a second, parallel paragraph on the creation, disobedience, and punishment of Adam and Eve condensed to omit Ælfric's lengthy description of the creation of the physical world, Adam's naming of the animals in paradise, and, most importantly, God's act of mercy in clothing of the two fallen humans before their expulsion from paradise and his immediate consideration of *hu he mihte his 7 ealles mancynnes eft gemiltsian* (Clemoes 184/160–1, 'how he might again have mercy on him and on all mankind'). Similarly, among Wulfstan's many omissions from Ælfric's account of the Flood is God's merciful promise never to send another flood to destroy humanity, along with God's sign of his promise in the rainbow. Wulfstan omits Ælfric's narration of the tower of Babel story entirely, although it would seem the natural culmination of this section of the homily; perhaps he was dissuaded from including it by Ælfric's emphasis on the origin of diverse languages rather than on the presumption and punishment of the Babylonians. He replaces Ælfric's consideration of whether the devil can create with an extended digression on the devil's power to deceive that owes much to his descriptions of Antichrist in the eschatological homilies.⁴³

³⁹ The opening paragraph is based on Pirmin; see Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, pp. 55–6. Bethurum (p. 294n) observes that such admonitions were common in patristic sources, and notes that Pirmin's source is Caesarius of Arles. The passage from Ezechiel was, as Tom Hall points out, one of Wulfstan's favorites, recurring five times throughout his writings; see 'Wulfstan's Latin Sermons', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 102–3.

⁴⁰ Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, p. 61.

⁴¹ Cf. Malcolm Godden's comment that 'Where Ælfric saw history as one long cycle of fall and redemption, Wulfstan tended to see it as a series of recurrent cycles of sin and punishment' in 'The Relations of Wulfstan and Ælfric: A Reassessment', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 353–74, at p. 374.

⁴² Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, p. 51.

⁴³ Specifically, Bethurum points out (p. 296n) similarities between this passage and similar passages referring to Antichrist in *Secundum Marcum* (139/88–140/96) and *De temporibus Anticristi* (129/17–22).

Bethurum's suggestion that this passage is a 'late addition' to the homily, owing to what she perceives as an 'awkward' transition back to the historical outline,⁴⁴ seems to me unfounded; rather, Wulfstan's digression was most likely suggested by Ælfric's own excursus on the devil's lack of creative powers – a subject that accords well with Ælfric's focus on origins, but not with Wulfstan's emphasis on sins that are committed, as he notes repeatedly, *þurh deofles lare* ('through the devil's teachings'). Both homilists emphasize that the history of the Israelites is important primarily because it was their line that eventually produced Mary, the mother of Jesus, but whereas Ælfric includes the miracles God performed for the Israelites, Wulfstan omits any mention of miracles and instead adds an account of the Israelites' sins and the resultant seventy years of captivity before moving to a narration of the nativity, life, and passion of Christ.

For Wulfstan, the incarnation of Christ is the only miracle and act of divine mercy worth mentioning in the homily; his earlier omissions serve to heighten the rhetorical impact of the redemption made possible through Christ's sacrifice. God, he says, could not have been 'more merciful' (*mildra*) than to send his son as a redeemer for humanity, and he comments repeatedly upon the miraculous nature of everything concerning the incarnation: it is a 'very great miracle' (*ful mycel wundor*) that a virgin could give birth; Christ's humanity is 'miraculous' (*wunderlic*); Christ humbles himself 'miraculously' (*wundorlice*) to become man and works 'many miracles' (*mænige wundra*) throughout his lifetime. After the unremitting accounts of God's punishment of sinners, this passage must have evoked an almost palpable relief in its audience; that relief, however, would have been short-lived as Wulfstan immediately moves to an account of the Last Judgment. Ælfric devotes only two short sentences to the subject in his homily; in contrast, Wulfstan draws on his eschatological homilies for an expanded passage concerning the advent of Antichrist and the events of the Final Days. He reminds his audience that the end is certainly near at hand (*nu georne nealæcð*, Bethurum 154/197) because *we habbað gecnawen fela þæra fortacna þe Crist sylf foresæde þæt cuman scolde* (154/197–155/198, 'we have recognized many of the signs that Christ himself prophesied would come'). The future, he says, will hold *swa egeslic tima swa æfre ær næs syððan þeos woruld gewearð* (155/200–1, 'the most terrifying time that ever was since this world began') because Antichrist's time is coming very quickly (*swyðe raðe*, 155/202), and through him all the world will be oppressed and afflicted (*gedreht and gedrefed*, 155/204). It would even be destroyed entirely if God did not shorten Antichrist's time, but God will shorten the time for the sake of his elect. Therefore it is important that each person *don swa us mycel þearfis* (156/214, 'do as is greatly necessary for us'), that is, love God and faithfully keep his commandments in order to earn (*geearnige*) the redemption made possible through Christ.

The rhetorical effect of Wulfstan's changes, omissions, and additions to Ælfric's homily is striking. Ælfric's loving Creator may find it necessary to punish erring humanity, but he nonetheless thinks to clothe Adam and

⁴⁴ Bethurum, p. 296n.

Eve after their transgression and immediately begins to plan how he might soften their suffering; in addition, he promises never to destroy humanity with another flood and sets his rainbow as a sign of that promise to Noah and his descendants. Wulfstan's God is portrayed as punishing the disobedient without remorse; the homily presents Old Testament history as a cycle of transgression and punishment that is inevitably followed by renewed transgression and further punishment. Whereas Ælfric concentrates on teaching the story and thus lingers lovingly over its details – the particulars of the creation, conversations between the participants in each event – taking care to explain the allegorical significance and theological implications of the events he narrates, Wulfstan uses the alternation of sin and punishment to transform his homily into a vehicle for moral exhortation, both implied and explicit. His omission of God's miracles and acts of mercy before the incarnation not only intensifies the terror of God's final judgment of humanity, but also makes God's supreme act of mercy – sacrificing his only son for the redemption of humankind – stand out in stark relief.

Historically, Wulfstan's audience is situated between the incarnation and the final judgment, with the hope of Christ's redemption, but faced with the terror of the events to come. Nevertheless, Wulfstan also incorporates his audience into the Old Testament portion of the homily by reminding them that all who are alive today are the descendants of Noah, and by pointing out that just as in the case of Noah's immediate descendants, the devil has the power to tempt people in their thoughts and can deceive them into making offerings to wells or stones – superstitious practices that may well have been observed in Anglo-Saxon England. Moreover, when Wulfstan describes the Israelites becoming *swa wið God forworht þæt he let faran hæpene here 7 forhergian eall þæt land* ('such criminals against God that he let a heathen army destroy all that land'), it would be difficult for an early-eleventh-century English audience not to think of the heathen Danish army threatening to destroy their own land. The homily demonstrates, in fact, that Wulfstan was already thinking of the English in terms of both the Old and New Testament paradigms that he uses to much greater rhetorical effect in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*.

Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi is a transitional work that maintains Wulfstan's focus, established in the eschatological homilies, on the moral imperatives of the impending end of the world at the same time as it indicates an awareness on Wulfstan's part of his newly assumed episcopal and archiepiscopal responsibility to instruct the clergy and the faithful in the Christian faith. The homily provides a fitting continuation of Wulfstan's series of eschatological sermons, while as its rubric indicates it also signals the beginning of a new group of homilies designed to teach both laity and clergy the basics of Christianity. The text that follows in three of the manuscripts, *De fide catholica*, exhibits the same blend of old concerns and new: it is also concerned with salvation history, presented this time in the context of the Creed, and it once again draws heavily on Ælfric's work.

De fide catholica is rubricated in full only in B; moreover, only B presents the sermon as a single homily, the form in which it is edited by both Bethurum

and Napier. E divides the text into two homilies: the first is set off with the numeral 'II.' in the margin and carries a truncated rubric, *ITEM SERMO. DE FIDE*; the second is rubricated *ITEM SERMO*. The version in C is not rubricated at all at the beginning of the text; however, at the point at which E divides the text, C contains the rubric *DE SERMO*.⁴⁵ Certainly the text falls neatly into two parts, each beginning *Leofan men* and each concluding with a rhetorical closing formula. Thus the first section, which ends in C and E with 'And ðæne geleafan mot ælc ðæra rihtlice cunnan 7 anrædlice healdan þe geearnian wile ece myrðe æt ðam soðan Gode, þe leofað 7 rixað in ealra worulda woruld a butan ende, amen' (Bethurum 158/22–5, 'And that faith must be understood correctly and steadfastly kept by each person who would earn eternal happiness from the true God, who lives and rules in the world of all worlds always without end, amen'), could easily be considered a separate homily despite its brevity (twenty-four lines in Bethurum's edition), and it was apparently understood as such by the scribe of the CE exemplar. The B scribe, in contrast, provides a somewhat abbreviated version of the closing formula at the end of section one – *Ðæne mot ælc þara rihtlice cunnan . 7 anrædlic healdan þe geearnian wile ece myrðe æt þam soðan gode þe leofað . 7 rixað . a butan ende*⁴⁶ ('That [faith] must be understood correctly and steadfastly kept by each person who would earn eternal happiness from the true God who lives and rules always without end') – omits the 'amen', and continues without a break into the second section.

The question of whether Wulfstan intended the text to be read as one homily or two is not easily resolvable, yet the evidence would point to a single homily. C and E belong to the same recension of Wulfstan's homilies and most likely derive from a common exemplar, while B represents a different recension and sometimes – as in the case of the *Sermo ad populum* – contains earlier variants of Wulfstan's texts.⁴⁷ Moreover, the truncated rubric for section one in E, *De fide*, would seem to be a scribal abbreviation of the longer rubric contained in B, rather than B's being an expansion of E. The intermediary rubrics may also be scribal: it would be a simple matter for a scribe to add an automatic 'amen' to the end of what appeared to be a standard closing formula and, seeing that his next sentence began with *Leofan men*, add an all-purpose rubric of the type found in C and E – possibly in this case simply *Sermo*. In addition, the structure of the homily may be usefully compared to that of Wulfstan's English translation of the Pater Noster and Creed: like *De fide catholica*, that homily is divided into two sections, each beginning *Leofan men* and each ending with similar closing formulas, yet is treated as a single homily in the manuscripts.⁴⁸ In both the translation and *De fide catholica*,

⁴⁵ It is thus possible that the C scribe regarded the beginning of *De fide catholica* as a continuation of *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi*.

⁴⁶ Transcribed from B, p. 164.

⁴⁷ But see Bethurum, p. 308n. Although she does not discuss her editorial decision or the relative chronology of the two variants, she casually refers to the 'earlier version' – i.e., that found in C and E – in her note to lines 90–39.

⁴⁸ The homily is extant in full in G and K. C contains a partial version that is incorporated into the text of Wulfstan's Pastoral Letter. See my discussion of Napier homilies 23–5 in Chapter 2 as well as the more complete discussion in Lionarons, 'Textual Identity'.

thematic continuity between the two sections is established by the mention of the two prayers in section one, which then contains an explanation or translation of the Pater Noster, with section two devoted to the Creed, followed once again by a reference to both prayers. Thus the manuscript evidence for *De fide catholica*, the extreme shortness of the first section, the thematic continuity between the two sections, and the similarity to Wulfstan's homily containing his translations of the Pater Noster and Creed suggest that the text was composed as a single homily.

The first section of *De fide catholica* emphasizes the necessity for all Christians to understand their faith; the vehicles for that understanding, Wulfstan states, are the two prayers that every Christian should know (*þæt ælc cristen man huru cunnan sceal*, Bethurum 157/8–9): the Pater Noster and the Apostle's Creed. In fact, canon law stipulated that all catechumens memorize the two prayers before receiving baptism and that children baptized as infants be taught the prayers as soon as they were able to learn them. As early as the eighth century, Bede had recommended the translation of the prayers into English, advising that *idiotas, hoc est, eos qui propriae linguae notitiam habent, haec ipsa sua lingua discere, ac sedulo decantare*⁴⁹ ('the unlearned, that is, those who have knowledge of only their own language, should say them in their own language, and recite them sedulously'). Both Ælfric and Wulfstan, following Bede, also recommend that if a person cannot learn the prayers in Latin, he or she should memorize them in English, and both provide English translations.⁵⁰ Wulfstan's translations are extant in a single homily surviving in G and K, with a partial version, containing only the translation of the Creed, in C; in addition, a few lines appear in E.⁵¹ The versions in C and K are part of a series of texts rubricated *To Eallum Folce* or *To Folke* that are part of (in C and E) or associated with (in K) Wulfstan's Pastoral Letter;⁵² however, the G text appears as an independent homily under the rubric *Be ðæs halgan sunnandæges gebede*, one of a series of miscellaneous texts following Wulfstan's *Institutes of Polity* and preceding two penitentials, the first derived from Halitgar, the second consisting of excerpts from the *Confessionale pseudo-Egberti*.⁵³ Both Bethurum and Napier base their editions on G (Bethurum VIIa; Napier 26), although Bethurum somewhat inexplicably appropriates K's rubric to give her version the title *To Eallum Folke*.

As noted above, both the translation homily and *De fide catholica* are divided into two unequal parts, one on the Pater Noster and one on the Creed. This common structure suggests that the homilies were composed at the same time; it is possible that Wulfstan made the translations in preparation for writing his interpretation of the prayers in *De fide catholica*. His translation of

⁴⁹ 'Epistola ad Egbertum episcopum', *Venerabilis Baedae opera historica*, ed. Charles Plummer, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986; repr. 1956), pp. 405–23, at p. 409.

⁵⁰ Ælfric translates the Pater Noster in the first series of his *Catholic Homilies*, no. 19, *Feria III de Dominica oratione*, Clemoes, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies*, pp. 264–80.

⁵¹ Fol. 65'. See the discussion of Napier 26 in Chapter 2.

⁵² Again, see the discussion of the homily in Chapter 2.

⁵³ See Ker, item 338, pp. 412–17.

the Pater Noster owes nothing to Ælfric's translation in *Feria III de Dominica oratione*; like his translation of the Creed, it is fully 'Wulfstanized' in vocabulary and style, largely through the addition of typically Wulfstanian words and phrases that augment the Latin text. Some additions are purely stylistic: these include doublets like *gesceop 7 geworhte* (Bethurum 167/22, 'created and made'), *gelyfað 7 georne witan* (167/23, 33, 'believe and earnestly know'), *micel geðolode 7 stiðlice þrowode* (167/25, 'suffered greatly and strongly endured'), and *ða godan 7 wel cristenan* (167/38, 'the good and proper Christians') in the Creed. Others provide both rhetorical augmentation and thematic emphasis, such as Wulfstan's reiteration of the eternal nature of God and his kingdom in the Pater Noster provided by *a* ('ever'), *ecelice* ('eternally'), and *symble* ('always'); his assertion in the Creed that Christ's suffering was *for ure ealra neode* (167/26–7, 'for all our need'); and his anaphoric repetition in both the translation and *De fide catholica* of the phrase *7 we gelyfað* ('and we believe'). His exhortation in the Pater Noster that we not be tempted *ealles to swyðe* (166/13, 'all too strongly') is at the same time a characteristic example of Wulfstanian litotes and a reflection of Wulfstan's abiding concern with the devil's deceptions. Moreover, two additions to the translation of the Creed clearly accentuate the miraculous character of Christ's birth and death: the clause *þe næfre nahte weres gemanan* (167/25, 'who had never had a man as husband') emphasizes Mary's virginity, already expressed in the words *clæne mæden* (167/24–5, 'pure virgin'), while *7 ðærof gehergode eal þæt he wolde* (167/29–30, 'and he took from [hell] those whom he wanted') not only indicates Christ's power, but also the fact that all of the events of *þæt mæste wundor* (159/53, 'that greatest miracle') were manifestations of the will of God.

In *De fide catholica*, Wulfstan assumes throughout that his audience knows the texts of the prayers. His brief comments on the Pater Noster in section one – that it was first spoken by Christ himself and that it contains seven invocations that will suffice for every need – may, in spite of their commonplace nature, derive from Ælfric's *De dominica oratione*, but whereas Ælfric explains and comments on each of the seven invocations at length, Wulfstan appears to regard the prayer as sufficiently self-explanatory for his purposes. The remainder of Wulfstan's homily is devoted to the longer and more complex Apostle's Creed: section one ends with a short paragraph concerning its origins, while section two contains a lengthy explanation of the prayer itself.

Although Bethurum states that the text of *De fide catholica* is not overly dependent upon any one source,⁵⁴ a close examination makes it clear that, as with *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi*, Wulfstan had Ælfric's *De initio creaturae* in his mind – and possibly on his desk – while composing the homily. In addition, as in *Incipiunt sermones*, he drew heavily on his earlier eschatological sermons for his account of the Last Judgment. Although Wulfstan does not provide the text of the Creed, the structure of his homily follows the order of the prayer, and therefore, since the Creed provides a brief recapitulation of salvation history, it follows the order of Ælfric's *De initio creaturae* as well,

⁵⁴ Bethurum, p. 301.

allowing Wulfstan to use Ælfric's homily as his guide in commenting on the prayer. The omission of the Old Testament material, however, changes both the emphasis and the tone from that found in *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi*: rather than focusing on transgression and punishment, *De fide catholica* directs the audience's attention to the first and second comings of Christ; celebrates his miracles, his mercy, and his justice; and offers what for Wulfstan is a peculiarly balanced view of the afterlife, with descriptions of both the blessed and the damned.

Wulfstan's explanation of the first lines of the Creed verges on direct translation, but also recalls the first lines of Ælfric's homily when he writes, *An is ece God, fæder ælmihtig, þe gescop heofonas 7 eorðan 7 ealle gesceafta. On þæne we gelyfað 7 on his sunu, urne Drihten Crist, 7 on þone halgan gast* (Bethurum 158/27–30, 'There is one eternal God, the Father almighty, who created the heavens and the earth and all creatures. In him we believe and in his son, our Lord Christ, and in the Holy Spirit'). Ælfric's text begins: *An angin is ealra þinga þæt is god ælmihtig . . . He hylt mid his mihte heofonas. 7 eorðan. 7 ealle gesceafta* (Clemoes 178/6–10, 'There is one origin of all things; that is God almighty . . . He holds with his might the heavens and the earth and all creatures'). The addition of *þone halgan gast* to Wulfstan's paraphrase of the opening lines of the prayer leads him to a discussion of the Trinity, the subject that follows immediately in Ælfric's homily, despite the fact that the Creed never discusses the Trinity as such; this change allows Wulfstan to emphasize the dual nature of Christ as both God and man and thus to focus his homily more precisely upon the miracle of the incarnation.

In his paraphrase of the next line of the Creed, Wulfstan again echoes without directly quoting Ælfric's text. Where Ælfric writes (Clemoes 187/237–41)

þa com se engel to hire 7 hi gegrette mid godes wordum 7 cydde hyre þæt godes sunu sceolde beon acenned of hire buton weres gemanan. 7 heo þa gelyfde his wordum 7 wearð mid cyldre; þa ða hyre tima com heo acende. 7 þurhwunode mæden

Then the angel came to her and greeted her with God's words and told her that God's son should be born of her without a man, and she believed his words and became with child. When her time came she gave birth and remained a virgin

Wulfstan has (Bethurum 158/40–159/45)

þa sende he his heahengel Gabriel to ðam mæran mædene, Sancta Marian, 7 he hyre gecydde þæt heo scolde geberan Godes sunu. And sona swa he þæt word gecwæp 7 heo hit mid geleafan underfeng, þa wearð heo þurh haligne gast on innoðe geeacnod 7 mid þam cilde wearð sona, 7 þæt gebær, ða hit þæs tima wæs

then he sent his archangel Gabriel to the noble maiden, Saint Mary, and he made known to her that she would bear God's son. And as soon as he spoke the words and she received them with faith, she conceived in her womb through the Holy Spirit and was immediately with child, and bore that child, when it was time.

The Creed moves immediately to the crucifixion and its aftermath; however, Wulfstan continues to follow Ælfric's text, making use of a passage he declined to treat in *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi* to provide a condensed account of

Christ's miracles: *he furðor openlice cydde þurh ða wundra þe he worhte þæt he wæs soðlice Godes sylfes sunu . . . Hit is on hrædinge earfoðrecce hwæt he gesawenlicra wundra geworhte ær þæt mæste gewurde. He hælde blinde 7 deafe 7 dumbe 7 mistlice gebrocode 7 arærde mænigne man of deaþe* (Bethurum 159/47–53; 'he openly made known through the miracles he worked that he was truly the son of God himself . . . It is difficult to say quickly what visible miracles he worked before that might happen. He healed the blind and deaf and dumb and those with various illnesses and raised many people from death'). An additional miracle – *he gehwyrfde wæter to wine* ('he changed water into wine') – found in Ælfric's text but not in the B version of Wulfstan's, was added either by the scribe of the CE exemplar or by Wulfstan himself.⁵⁵

Wulfstan's narration of Christ's passion draws some of its phrasing from Ælfric's text as well, but here Wulfstan expands on his source to incorporate additional details of the crucifixion and to emphasize its paradoxical nature. Where Ælfric writes simply that *Crist þa gefafoðe þæt ða wælhæxan hine genamon. 7 gebundon; 7 on rodehæncgene acwealdan* (Clemoes 188/275–6, 'Christ then consented that the cruel men take him and bind him and kill him hanging on the cross'), Wulfstan has *he gefafoðe, swa he sylf wolde, þæt hine man to deaþe forrædde. Hine man band, 7 hine man swang, 7 æt nyhstan on rode aheng, 7 him ægðer þurhðraf mid isenum næglum ge fet ge handa 7 swa ða Iudeas þurh deofles lare þa menniscnesse to deaðe acoman* (Bethurum 159/54–9; 'he consented, as he himself willed, that men put him to death. He was bound and beaten and at last hung on the cross, and iron nails were driven through his feet and hands and thus the Jews through the devil's teaching put his human body to death'). Christ's death occurs both through his own will (*swa he sylf wolde*) and through the teachings of the devil (*þurh deofles lare*); it is both self-sacrifice and murder, and it leads to a triumphant victory in the guise of humiliating defeat. Wulfstan therefore links the crucifixion to his earlier account of Christ's miracles: how, he asks, could there be a greater miracle (*mare wundor*, 159/59) than this, that one who had power over all creation should allow himself to die the most wretched of deaths?

Wulfstan's account of the harrowing of hell, resurrection, and ascension continues to show reliance on Ælfric's sermon. His vocabulary echoes Ælfric's (e.g., *ðone deofol gewylde*, 'conquered the devil'; Bethurum 160/67; Clemoes 188/278), even when he condenses Ælfric's text: one may compare Ælfric's statement that Christ *him of anam adam and euan. 7 heora ofspring. þone dæl þe him ær gecwæmde 7 gelædde hi to hiora lichaman. 7 aras of deaðe mid þam miclum wereðe* (Clemoes 188/278/80, 'took from [the devil] Adam and Eve and those of their offspring who had pleased him before and led them to their bodies and rose from death with a great host') to Wulfstan's laconic *of helle ut gelædde ealle þa ðe him sylfum gecweme wæron* (Bethurum 160/68, 'led out of hell all those who were pleasing to himself'). Elsewhere, however, Wulfstan departs from Ælfric's account to strengthen certain phrases for increased rhetorical effect: whereas Ælfric merely states that Christ *to helle gewende* (Clemoes 188/277–8,

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 308n. See Clemoes, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies*, 187/254–5.

‘went to hell’), Wulfstan emphasizes Christ’s power and divinity when he writes that *he abrac þurh his godcundan mihte hella geata* (Bethurum 160/66–7, ‘through his divine might he broke the gates of hell’).

Particularly notable is Wulfstan’s translation and discussion of the Creed’s clause concerning *sanctorum communio*, in part because the precise meaning of ‘community of saints’ was a matter of some debate within the medieval church,⁵⁶ and in part because it highlights an additional purpose of all didactic sermons, the creation of a conscious Christian community – a purpose that would be especially important in a homily designed to teach the fundamentals of the faith through the common prayers that bring all Christians into a single community. The communion of saints was often held to indicate the Church itself, comprising all of the saints of all times and culminating in their eternal communion in the kingdom of heaven. This opinion was held by most of the Carolingian writers, and it is their view that Wulfstan’s homily largely reflects: *we gelyfað þæt . . . ða syn Gode leofe þe þurh anfeald geðanc hine lufiað 7 heriað. And we gelyfað þæt haligra gemana sy. Halige men habbað gemanan her on life on godum dædum, 7 hy habbað eac gemanan on þæm toweardan þurh ða edlean þe heom þonne God gyfð* (Bethurum 161/88–93; ‘we believe that . . . they are dear to God who love and praise him through resolute thought. And we believe that to be the communion of saints. Holy men have community here in life in good deeds, and they will also have community in the life to come through the reward that God will give them’). While few of Wulfstan’s audience would aspire to sainthood, the idea of maintaining their own Christian community in the afterlife is an idea that would be attractive to an Anglo-Saxon audience whose society was built on ties of kinship and loyalty. Certainly one of Wulfstan’s goals would have been to make the bonds and obligations of a community of faith at least as important as secular bonds and obligations, and preaching was one way to build that community and strengthen its ties.

On the other hand, the phrase could be taken simply to mean the act of the eucharist, as, for example, when the Council of Nîmes in 394 forbade heretical priests from participating in the sacrament, referred to as *sanctorum communio*. C and E replace the clause *And we gelyfað þæt haligra gemana sy* (‘And we believe that to be the communion of saints’) with *7 haligra husling is 7 on cristendome haligra gemana*⁵⁷ (‘and [that] is the eucharist of the saints and in Christendom the community of the saints’). Bethurum speculates that the phrases in C and E reflect an earlier version of the homily that Wulfstan later revised to remove *7 haligra husling is*, possibly after translating Amalarius of Metz’s *De ecclesiasticis officiis*.⁵⁸ If so, the ‘earlier version’ is curiously garbled, lacking a subject for the verb *is* and breaking – or more precisely delaying the introduction of – the repeated sequence of the words *and we gelyfað* (‘and we believe’), with which Wulfstan begins three additional sentences within the paragraph. It seems more likely that the words in C and E derive from a

⁵⁶ See Bethurum’s discussion of the phrase, to which I am indebted throughout, p. 308n.

⁵⁷ And not, as Bethurum says (p. 308n), simply *7 husling is*. The correct emendation is, however, given in her textual notes to the lines, p. 161.

⁵⁸ Bethurum, p. 308n.

reinterpretation of *haligra gemana* by a scribe who wanted to allow for both definitions of the phrase at once.

The Creed continues with *Confiteor unum baptisma in remissionem peccatorum. Et exspecto resurrectionem mortuorum, et vitam venturi saeculi* ('I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. And I await the resurrection of those who have died, and life in the age to come'), and Wulfstan provides a loose translation of each phrase, followed by a brief explanation: *And we gelyfað þæt synna forgyfenes sy ærest þurh rihtne geleafan 7 ðurh fulluht 7 eft þurh synna behreowsunge.*⁵⁹ *And we gelyfað þæt ærist sy on domesdæge ealra manna. And we gelyfað þæt ece lif sy, forðam ealswa þa godan habbað ece lif on myrhðe, swa habbað þa yfelan 7 þa forwyrhtan ece lif on yrmðe, 7 ðæs æfre ænig ende ne cymð* (Bethurum 161/93–9; 'And we believe that the forgiveness of sins comes first through correct belief and through baptism and then through repentance for sin. And we believe that on judgment day all people will arise. And we believe that eternal life will come, because as the good will have eternal life in happiness, so the evil and condemned will have eternal life in misery, and an end to that will never come'). The lines are Wulfstan's starting point for a lengthy description of the Day of Judgment, portions of which he reused in the Pastoral Letter; the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*; Napier homilies 1, 50, and 60; and several of his law codes. The popularity of the passage is indicated by the fact that borrowings derived from this part of the sermon also appear in a number of anonymous homilies, including Napier 42, 43, and 57, as well as a Rogationtide sermon extant in F and rubricated *De letania maiore*.⁶⁰

In writing his description of the Judgment, Wulfstan quite naturally incorporates parts of his eschatological writings, particularly *Secundum Lucam*, which provides a short description of the torments of hell, as well as the assertions that it would be better not to have been born than to suffer such pain and that no one can correctly describe the eternal misery of the condemned souls. Wulfstan also echoes his conclusion to *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi* when he states that *we georne geseoð 7 gelomlice gecnawað be ðam tacnum þe Crist sylf foresæde þæt hit nu georne nealæcð to þam dome þe he sylf to cymð* (Bethurum 161/104–6, 'we have seen and often recognized by the signs that Christ himself prophesied that it is now very close to the judgment when he himself will come'). Yet the majority of the passage is substantially new, including Wulfstan's first version of the alliterating list of condemned sinners that was to become one of his most often-recycled (and most often-borrowed) parts of his homilies, and for which he apparently coined two new compounds: *manswican* (163/129), generally defined as 'traitors' and paired

⁵⁹ Ibid., pp. 308–9n, for a discussion of Wulfstan's use of Rabanus Maurus's *De ecclesiastica disciplina* as a source for this sentence.

⁶⁰ Napier 42 is a translation of Adso of Montier-en-Der's *Libellus de Anticristo*, discussed in Chapter 2; Napier 43 and 57 are versions of the so-called 'Sunday Letter'. *De letania maiore* has been printed by J. Bazire and J. E. Cross as their Homily 8, see *Eleven Old English Rogationtide Homilies* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), pp. 90–100. For discussions of the 'Wulfstanization' of all four homilies, see Wilcox, 'Dissemination', pp. 207–8 and 211–13; see also D. G. Scragg, 'The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Saints' Lives before Ælfric', *Anglo-Saxon England* 8 (1979), 223–77.

here as elsewhere with *mannslagan* ('murderers'), and *woruldstruder* (163/131, 'spoliators, robbers'), a term Wulfstan uses again in his Pastoral Letter to refer to those who alienate church property,⁶¹ and which is used here not for its alliteration, but rather for the rhyme it provides in the series *gitseras, ryperas 7 reaferas* (163/131, 'misers, robbers and looters'). Likewise new is the image of the resurrected dead making their way across a burning earth to the judgment, with the guiltless passing through the flames unsinged; new as well is the description, based on Matthew 25: 31–46, of Christ's division of the souls into the saved and the condemned, along with his words to each and their subsequent fates. What is unusual for Wulfstan in this homily is his addition of a passage describing the happiness of the saved souls to parallel his description of the condemned. The passage is necessary here not only to continue the theme of the community of saints but also to underscore Wulfstan's major point about the miracle of Christ's incarnation. It epitomizes the difference between *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi* and *De fide catholica*: whereas the first homily placed its emphasis on a grimly punishing God whose mercy was confined to the single, overwhelming miracle of Christ, the second focuses its attention not only on that miracle but also the possibility of redemption that it offers. If the homily spends more time on hell than on heaven, it is because to do so apparently accorded more with Wulfstan's temperament, his aesthetic of endings rather than of beginnings.

In addition to a common faith and common prayers, a conscious Christian community needs a communal code of moral behavior. To address this need, Wulfstan wrote two sermons on the ten commandments and the eight capital sins, one in Latin (*De cristianitate*; Bethurum Xb; Napier 9) and one in English (*Her ongynd be cristendome*; Bethurum Xc; Napier 10). Bethurum prints these homilies along with *De regula canonicorum* (Homily Xa) as a related series of three sermons on the Christian life, despite the fact that *De regula canonicorum* is not a homily. Her rationale would appear to be, in part, that Wulfstan uses portions of the first two texts as sources for the third, and in part that, taken together, the three works provide Wulfstan's guidelines for non-monastic Christian living, first for the secular clergy and then for the population as a whole. Extant in C and E, *De cristianitate* is a Latin text largely made up of a series of extracts taken from the *Dicta abbatis Pirmini*⁶² (which is in turn a collection of excerpts from a variety of sources, including the sermons of Caesarius of Arles, Martin of Bracara's *De correctione rusticorum*, and the Benedictine Rule) and the *De pressuris ecclesiasticis* of Atto of Vercelli.⁶³ The text serves as an outline for the expanded English translation, *Her ongynd be cristendome*, which it precedes in both manuscripts; in addition, copies of the English homily survive in B, where the text follows the non-Wulfstanian *De die iudicii* (Napier 40), and in I, where the homily is rubricated *Be cristendome*

⁶¹ Bethurum, pp. 310–11n.

⁶² Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, pp. 45–55.

⁶³ Bethurum, p. 307; Orchard, 'Re-editing Wulfstan', p. 71. For a discussion of the relationship between the Latin text and its sources, see Karl Jost, 'Einige Wulfstantexte und ihre Quellen', *Anglia* 56 (1932), 265–315, at pp. 280–3.

and has been annotated in the Wulfstan hand.⁶⁴

Wulfstan begins *Her ongynd be cristendome* with the clear statement that one cannot be part of the Christian community in name only: *Lytel fremað þeah cristen nama butan cristenum dædum* (Bethurum 200/8–9, ‘the name of Christian means little without Christian deeds’). The remainder of the homily is made up of an exhaustive listing of injunctions concerning correct behavior, with the ten commandments comprising only the first in the list, and the eight capital sins incorporated into an admonition to guard against the works of the devil. The performativity of this homily is particularly interesting, as Wulfstan must alternate between positioning himself outside of the community as an authority figure fit to instruct his congregation, and inside the community as a humble fellow Christian who must also follow the instructions he gives. Throughout the first part of the homily, which deals primarily with the ten commandments, Wulfstan consistently positions himself as part of the community, using a plural ‘we’ to refer to himself along with his congregation. Rhetorical authority is given over to the words of God – but those words, of course, would be spoken in performance by Wulfstan himself, first in the voice of Christ from John 14: 15, telling his people in Latin and English, *Si diligitis me, mandata mea seruare. Gyf ge me lufian, he cwæð, folgiað minum larum* (Bethurum 200/15–16, ‘if you love me, follow my commandments. If you love me, he said, follow my teachings’) and then in the explicitly loud voice (*hludre stefne*, Bethurum 201/21) of God giving the commandments to Moses. Both citations are followed by statements that *we* (Bethurum 201/34; *we . . . þe cristene syndon*; ‘we . . . who are Christians’, 201/18–19) must follow God’s teachings and obey his commands, not only the familiar ten commandments, but *fela hertoeacan* (Bethurum 201/34, ‘many others besides’)

In the second part of the homily, which lists more than seventy-five injunctions to the faithful, the ‘we’ of the earlier portion changes to ‘I’ as Wulfstan repeatedly exhorts his audience that they *doð swa ic lære* (Bethurum 203/76–7, ‘do as I teach’). Here he appropriates not only the authority that automatically accords to his role as preacher (and archbishop), but in context also borrows the sacred authority of the biblical commandments he has voiced in the first part of the text, for taken in the context of the homily, the injunctions would seem to comprise the *fela hertoeacan* that must also be obeyed. By relinquishing some of his authority through performative positioning at the beginning of the homily, therefore, Wulfstan enhances his position of authority for the rest of the sermon. He does not use the plural ‘we’ again until the end of the homily, when he merges himself back into the congregation with a short series of admonitions beginning *utan* + infinitive in the final lines of the text.

In both the Latin and English versions, Wulfstan relies on Exodus 20: 1–16 for the first eight commandments, then turns to Deuteronomy 5: 21 for nine and ten. In the Latin text, the commandments are numbered, making it clear that Wulfstan considered Deuteronomy 5: 21 to consist of two separate commandments, the first (number IX) forbidding the coveting of one’s neighbor’s

⁶⁴ Ker, ‘Handwriting’, p. 322.

wife, and the second (number X) one's neighbor's possessions – that is, one commandment condemns lust, the other greed.⁶⁵ In the English homily, however, there is no numbering, and the translation of Deuteronomy looks at first glance as if it comprises a single commandment, i.e., the tenth in the list. Thus if one counts backwards, *Ic eom ðin drihten, he cwæð, þe gelædde þe ut of Egyptum* (201/23–4, 'I am your lord, he said, who led you out of Egypt') somewhat confusingly becomes the first commandment. Only the Latin text clarifies the archbishop's intention. Wulfstan's version of the Decalogue in both homilies is derived from one found in W, which in turn is identical to a version of Ælfric's *Decalogus Moysi* extant in Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibliothèque Municipale, 63.⁶⁶

Wulfstan's listing of the eight capital sins is noteworthy for its differences from other standard lists. The concept of the eight sins was first articulated by Evagrius of Pontus in the fourth century, although Evagrius uses the term λογισμοί, derived from the 'evil thoughts' of Matthew 15: 19, rather than 'sins' to describe what he regards as the chief temptations besetting monks, in particular the desert hermits among whom he had lived.⁶⁷ His list comprises γαστριμαργία ('gluttony'), πορνεία ('lust'), φιλαργυρία ('avarice'), λύπη ('sadness'), ὀργή ('anger'), ἀκηδία ('sloth'), κενοδοξία ('vainglory'), and ὑπερηφανία ('pride').⁶⁸ It is, however, uncertain whether the idea of the eight sins originated with Evagrius. The concept is implicit in Origen, whose work and doctrines were one of Evagrius's major influences: all eight 'evil thoughts' appear in Origen's writings, sometimes within lists of sins that Siegfried Wenzel describes as 'fairly static though not as systematic as Evagrius'.⁶⁹ The number eight may also be seen as deriving from Origen, specifically from his interpretation of the battles fought by the Israelites against the seven Canaanite nations and Egypt, and of the parable found in Matthew 12: 43–5, where Jesus is reported as describing an 'unclean spirit' (*inmundus spiritus*) that, having been driven out of a man, returns with seven other spirits even 'more evil' (*nequiores*) than himself.⁷⁰ Moreover, as early as the second century BCE, the *Testament of Reuben* lists seven 'spirits of deceit'

⁶⁵ Aaron J. Kleist, 'The Division of the Ten Commandments in Anglo-Saxon England', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 103 (2002), 227–40, at p. 228.

⁶⁶ See Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, p. 49; 'Einige Wulfstanstexte', p. 278. For the identification of the W text as Ælfric's, see Fehr, *Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, p. 190; Clemoes, 'Supplement', pp. cxlvii–cxlviii; and 'The Old English Benedictine Office, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 190, and the Relationship between Ælfric and Wulfstan: A Reconsideration', *Anglia* 78 (1960), 265–83, at pp. 273–5 and 277–80.

⁶⁷ Siegfried Wenzel, *The Sin of Sloth: Acedia in Medieval Thought and Literature* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1967), p. 14. Wenzel points out as well that it is possible that Evagrius considered the struggle of the monks against such 'evil thoughts' as a struggle against literal demons.

⁶⁸ Morton W. Bloomfield, *The Seven Deadly Sins: An Introduction to the History of a Religious Concept, with Special Reference to Medieval English Literature* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1952. Rpt. 1967), p. 59.

⁶⁹ Wenzel, *The Sin of Sloth*, p. 16; see also Irénée Hausherr, 'De doctrina spirituali Christianorum orientalium quaestiones et scripta. 3. L'origine de la théorie orientale des huit péchés capitaux', *Orientalia Christiana* 30 (1933), 164–75, cited by Wenzel, *The Sin of Sloth*.

⁷⁰ Wenzel, *The Sin of Sloth*, p. 16.

that include four of Evagrius's 'evil thoughts' – γαστριμαργία, κενοδοξία, πορνεία, and ὑπερηφάνια – along with a fifth, μάχη ('strife'), that is similar although not identical to Evagrius's ὀργή ('anger').⁷¹

Evagrius's list of sins was brought to Gaul in the fifth century by John Cassian in his *De institutis coenobiorum* (c.425), a description of the monastic life in Egypt and Palestine. Books V–XII are devoted to the eight capital sins, which Cassian lists as *gastrimargia* ('gluttony'), *fornicatio* ('fornication/lust'), *filargyria* ('avarice'), *ira* ('anger'), *tristitia* ('sadness'), *acedia sive taedium cordis* ('sloth or weariness of heart'), *cenodoxia* ('vainglory'), and *superbia* ('pride'). Cassian follows Origen in providing a biblical justification for the list by identifying the sins with the seven Canaanite nations and Egypt, then adds a series of lesser sins that derive from each of the eight, as well as a corresponding list of the virtues that may be cultivated to replace the conquered vices.⁷² The list was revised and reordered by Gregory the Great in the sixth century in the *Moralia in Job*. In his commentary on Job 39: 25, Gregory moves vainglory (*vana gloria*) to the beginning of the list, placing gluttony (*gula*) and lust (*luxuria*) – the first two sins of Cassian's listing – at the end. In addition, he merges sloth (*acedia*) into sadness (*tristitia*),⁷³ adds envy (*invidia*) to the list, and removes the sin of pride (*superbia*) because it is the root of all the others. The resulting reduction of the list to seven sins rather than eight allows him to recommend the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit as aids in combating the sins; other medieval lists of *remedia* – including those found in Ælfric and Wulfstan – are made up of various combinations of the gifts of the Spirit, the cardinal virtues, and other miscellaneous virtues.

Both Ælfric and Wulfstan use John Cassian's list in their homilies rather than Gregory's, although they were most likely aware of the Gregorian tradition. In the first part of his homily for a Sunday in mid-Lent, *Dominica in media quadragesime*,⁷⁴ Ælfric tells the story of the crossing of the Red Sea and the defeat of Egypt as part of his explanation of the ten commandments; in the second part he relates the battles of the Israelites against the Canaanites in order to introduce his explication of the eight capital sins, providing a link between the two parts of the homily through the assertion that *Witodlice Iosue and israhela folc oferwunnon seofon ðeoda. eahtoðe wæs pharao ðe ær mid his leode adranc Swa sceolon eac cristene men ða eahta heafodleahtras mid heora werodum ealle oferwinnan* (Godden 123/477–81, 'clearly Joshua and the Israelites overcame seven nations; the eighth was Pharaoh, who drowned earlier with his people So must each Christian person overcome the eight capital sins with their hosts'). Although his list of sins follows John Cassian, Ælfric demonstrates his awareness of the Gregorian listing when he finds it necessary

⁷¹ R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908), II.i; III, 2 ff.; Bloomfield, *The Seven Deadly Sins*, pp. 44–5.

⁷² Wenzel, *The Sin of Sloth*, pp. 19, 21.

⁷³ For a discussion of the possible reasoning behind Gregory's merger of the two vices, see Wenzel, *The Sin of Sloth*, pp. 24–8.

⁷⁴ *Catholic Homilies* II.12. See Malcolm Godden, ed., *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series*, EETS ss 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 110–26. Hereafter cited in the text by page and line number.

to justify his placement of *modignys* ('pride') at the end of the list: *Modignys is endenext gesett on getele ðæra heafodleahtra. for ðan ðe se unwæra on ende oft modegað on godum weorcum. and nele gode ðancian. ðe hine mid halgum mægnum. healice geglengde* (Godden 125/536–9, 'Pride is set last in the list of the capital sins because in the end the unwary often take pride in good works and do not thank God that they have been adorned with holy strength'). Ælfric also gives remedies for each of the sins: *gemetegunge* ('moderation') for gluttony, *clænnysse* ('purity') for lust, *cystignysse* ('generosity') for avarice, *wislicum geðylde* ('wise patience') for anger, *gastlicere blisse* ('spiritual happiness') for worldly unhappiness, *anrædnysse* ('steadfastness') for sloth, *incundre lufe* ('inward love') for vainglory, and *eadmodnysse* ('humility') for pride. Ælfric's second Old English letter to Wulfstan provides the same listing in the same order, with only minor variations in wording for the remedies, that is, *modes geðild* ('patience of mind') rather than *wislicum geðylde* and *soðe lufu on Gode* ('true love for God') rather than *incundre lufe*.⁷⁵

Still, neither Wulfstan's listing of the eight chief sins in *De cristianitate* nor his discussion in *Her ongynd be cristendome* seem influenced by Ælfric's writings. Rather, as Jonathan Wilcox has shown, his list may be compared to a similar listing, most likely composed by Wulfstan himself and based on Alcuin's *De uirtutibus et vitiis*, found in C on the page preceding the Latin homily.⁷⁶ The order of the sins differs in the two texts: whereas the C text listing places *modignes* first, in the homily Wulfstan places *avaritia/gitsung* ('avarice') at the head of the list, justifying the choice by citing 1 Timothy 6: 10: *Radix malorum est cupiditas*, translated within the homily as *Gitsung is wyrtruma . . . æghwylces yfeles* (Bethurum 203/75–6, 'Avarice is the root . . . of each evil'). The remedies are catalogued as *rumheortnys 7 syfernys*, *clænnys 7 modþwærnes*, *glædnes 7 anrædnys*, *sybgeornes 7 eadmodnes* (203/68–9, 'generosity and abstinence, purity and patience, gladness and steadfastness, love and humility'); this list is identical to the tract in C, while only three of the eight remedies echo Ælfric's vocabulary.

In excerpting Pirmin for his homily, Wulfstan follows his usual practice of shortening and condensing his source at the same time as he incorporates new sentences and phrases that reflect his particular concerns. Thus, while he condenses a full paragraph on penance in Pirmin to a single sentence, Wulfstan adds an admonition to keep fast and feast days diligently, warns against cheating one's neighbor, and exhorts his audience to obey their earthly lords. He also supplements Pirmin by incorporating two short passages that are also extant in W: the first is a brief excerpt on the protection of the church, adapted from Atto of Vercelli's *De pressuris ecclesiasticis* and somewhat shortened from the W text; the second comprises two sentences on the rights of bishops excerpted from Ælfric's *De ecclesiastica consuetudine*. These sentences are found in the C text of both *De cristianitate* and *Her ongynd*

⁷⁵ Fehr, *Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, pp. 208, 212.

⁷⁶ Jonathan Wilcox, 'Napier's "Wulfstan" Homilies XL and XLII: Two Anonymous Works from Winchester?', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 90 (1991), pp. 8–10.

be cristendome and were written into the margin of the I text of *Her ongynd be cristendome* in Wulfstan's handwriting. Finally, rather than simply quoting Pirmin's adaptation of the Benedictine Rule, Wulfstan returns to the original, possibly from memory, for his injunctions to fear God's judgment and the terrors of hell.

Both excerpts from W introduce subjects that Wulfstan felt strongly about and that recur throughout his legal and homiletic writings. The Christian duty to honor the church and protect it from harm was not an abstract matter in Anglo-Saxon England, particularly in Wulfstan's see in York. The most obvious danger came from the Viking raiders;⁷⁷ however, Christian despoilers often presented as great a threat. John Blair notes that 'in the north and the east midlands, ecclesiastical asset-stripping from the late ninth century onwards [had] reduced a once-plutocratic Church to near poverty'.⁷⁸ Such 'asset-stripping' of churches and ecclesiastical estates could take several forms: churches could be plundered or destroyed by aristocratic overlords for personal gain or political reasons, they could be stripped of their valuables in order to pay the ever-increasing *heregeld*, or, less violent but perhaps more common, lands leased from church estates in the form of *lænland* to lay tenants could be lost if the tenants refused to relinquish their holdings when the lease expired.

An increasing number of churches in Anglo-Saxon England during the eleventh century were proprietary churches whose property rights were controlled by the patrons or lords who held the land on which they were built. They could thus be sold, bought, bequeathed, or given away, although they could not legally be used for other than religious purposes and church property was not to be alienated.⁷⁹ Nevertheless, there were cases of overlords who simply robbed their churches of furnishings or land. The most important and powerful overlord, of course, was the king himself. King Æthelred's diplomas reveal that in his youth he was persuaded by members of his *witan* to reduce the privileges and appropriate the estates of Abingdon Abbey and to take additional estates from the Old Minster, Glastonbury and the episcopal church at Rochester,⁸⁰ which he used to enrich his followers. Moreover, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* reports that in 986 Æthelred laid waste the diocese of Rochester for reasons that remain 'obscure',⁸¹ although the origins of the quarrel may have lain in a grant of *lænland* from Rochester's estates by Æthelred to one of his thegns.⁸² Wulfstan's *Chronicle* poem on the death of Edgar refers to the despoliation of Ælfhere of Mercia in the tenth

⁷⁷ For contemporary accounts of the Viking depredations, see R. I. Page, *A Most Vile People: Early English Historians on the Vikings* (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 1987).

⁷⁸ Blair, *Church*, p. 313.

⁷⁹ Bethurum, pp. 326–7n.

⁸⁰ S 987; S 918. See the discussions in Williams, *Æthelred the Unready*, p. 26, and Keynes, *The Diplomas of King Æthelred*, pp. 177–8.

⁸¹ Keynes, *The Diplomas of King Æthelred*, p. 178. For Sulcard of Westminster's version of the events, see Williams, *Æthelred the Unready*, pp. 26–7.

⁸² Williams, *Æthelred the Unready*, pp. 28–9.

century; Bethurum cites another instance at Evesham;⁸³ and Whitelock notes that ealdorman Ælfric received a papal letter threatening him with excommunication for his spoliation of Glastonbury.⁸⁴

Perhaps more common were instances of churches and monasteries being forced to alienate their estates and sell property in order to raise money to pay the *heregeld*. William of Malmesbury writes that Abbot Brihtwold of Malmesbury was compelled to alienate monastic estates through either sale or mortgage sometime between 1004 and 1007/12 in order to pay a heavy geld.⁸⁵ In addition, he writes that Glastonbury lost its estates in Wiltshire because of heavy taxation during the time of the Danes (*tempore Danorum*);⁸⁶ it is uncertain whether the phrase refers to the Danish rule under Cnut or to the earlier Danish raids.⁸⁷ Hemming's *Cartulary* describes the extremes to which Wulfstan's own church at Worcester was driven by the need to pay a *maximum et fere importabile tributum* ('very great and almost unbearable tribute') that was most likely the geld raised in 1013–14 to pay off Svein Forkbeard: *ob huius itaque tam grauis tributi exactionem, omnia fere ornamenta huius ecclesie distracta sunt; tabule altaris, argento et auro parate, spoliatae sunt, textus exornati [sic], calices confracti, cruces conflatae; ad ultimum etiam terre et uillule pecuniis distracte sunt* ('on account therefore of the exaction of this very heavy tribute, almost all the ornaments of this church were broken up; the altar panels, furnished with silver and gold, were stripped; ornamented books [and] chalices were destroyed, crosses were melted down; in the last resort even lands and villages were divested of their wealth').⁸⁸

Less violent, but probably the more frequent for that reason, was the loss of ecclesiastical *lænland* to tenants reluctant to relinquish their holdings to the church once their term had expired.⁸⁹ Such lands were usually granted for a term of three lifetimes, and it is understandable that tenants would be loathe to give up estates that had been in their family for generations and would seek patronage from the powerful in order to keep them. Stephen Baxter has demonstrated that when Wulfstan became bishop of Worcester, he found it necessary to take immediate steps to recover lands lost to the bishopric by

⁸³ *Chronicon abbatiae de Evesham ad annum 1418*, ed. W. D. Macray, Rolls Series 81 (London: Longman, 1863); see Bethurum, p. 327n.

⁸⁴ Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, p. 50n.

⁸⁵ William of Malmesbury, *De gestis pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, Rolls Series 52 (London: Longman, 1870), p. 411.

⁸⁶ William of Malmesbury, *De antiquitate Glastonie ecclesie*, ed. J. Scott (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1981), p. 140.

⁸⁷ See M. K. Lawson, 'The Collection of Danegeld and Heregeld in the Reigns of Æthelred II and Cnut', *English Historical Review* 99 (1984), 721–38, at p. 725.

⁸⁸ Hemming, *Chartularium ecclesiae Wigoriensis*, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1723), I, pp. 248–9. The text is cited and translated in Richard Gem, 'A Recession in Early English Architecture during the Early Eleventh Century, and its Effect on the Development of the Romanesque Style', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 38 (1975), 28–49, at p. 43. See also Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, p. 50n.

⁸⁹ Stephen Baxter calls loss of *lænland* 'one of the most serious tenurial problems encountered by the church of Worcester during the course of the eleventh century'; see 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Administration of God's Property', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 161–205, at p. 176.

his predecessors in this fashion, an endeavor which met with some success.⁹⁰ In addition, Wulfstan commissioned the earliest cartulary that has survived from Anglo-Saxon England, the *Liber Wigorniensis* (L, fols. 1–109, 111–15), most likely ‘as a way of maintaining tighter documentary control over his *lænland* tenants’.⁹¹ Wulfstan was also able to recover some lands lost from the archiepiscopal estates in the north. The so-called ‘Oswald memorandum’ in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Harley 55 details lands lost from the archiepiscopal estates as well as lands obtained in various ways by Oscytel (archbishop of York, 956–71); it ends with a statement to the effect that Oswald had held these lands until ‘Saint Peter was robbed of them’, apparently by one ‘Þorað’, who has been identified with Thored, earl of Deira c.975–92.⁹² Given his personal experiences with the difficulty of recovering lost ecclesiastical property, it is little wonder that Wulfstan repeatedly preaches against the spoliation of church estates. He harshly condemns all such practices in *De cristianitate* when he turns to Atto’s original text to quote a sentence not included in W, *Inimicus enim Cristi efficitur omnis qui ecclesiasticas res iniuste usurpare conatur* (Bethurum 195/40–1, ‘Indeed all who unjustly try to usurp the things of the church become enemies of Christ’), and follows it with Atto’s citation of Gregory: *Si quis ecclesiam Dei denudauerit uel sanctimonia uiolauerit, anathema sit; ad quod respondentes omnes dixerunt, amen* (195/41–3, ‘If anyone has despoiled the church of God or has violated its sanctuary, let him be anathema; and all responded, saying amen’⁹³). He returns to the subject most notably in the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, but perhaps more effectively in his law codes: VI Æthelred 15 forbids the desecration of churches, while VIII Æthelred 1–4 prescribes punishment for the violation of the right of sanctuary. Despoliation was to be punished by excommunication.⁹⁴

Protecting the church also implied, at least for Wulfstan, protecting the powers and privileges of bishops and archbishops, and Wulfstan’s final addition from W to the text of *De cristianitate* is a reminder to his audience that in certain cases it is both useful and necessary (*utile et necessarium*, Bethurum 197/86) to receive absolution from the bishop, who has received the power to bind and to loose on earth through Jesus Christ, the *mediator* between God and humanity. The sentences are, as noted above, taken from Ælfric’s *De consuetudine*, although like the excerpts from Atto and the Boulogne-sur-Mer 63 version of the Decalogue, Wulfstan may have first copied them into one of his ‘commonplace book’ manuscripts and only then adapted them for the homily. The sentences are extant in full in the C text of *De cristianitate*, coming immediately after a sentence from Pirmin on penance; the E scribe, however, copied only the first words into his Latin text before breaking off. Since the sentences from Ælfric make perfect sense inserted as they are in

⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 161–205.

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 176.

⁹² Ibid., p. 177. See also Hadley, *The Northern Danelaw*, p. 143.

⁹³ Gregory is alluding here to Deuteronomy 27: 15–26.

⁹⁴ Liebermann prints two excommunication formulas for despoliation: see Excommunication XII and XIII, *Gesetze*, I, p. 411.

C, it is likely that they appeared in the margin rather than the main text of Latin homily in the CE exemplar, and that the E scribe chose, for whatever reason, to omit them.

The lines themselves present something of a textual puzzle that, when taken together with their occurrences in the C and I texts of *Her ongynð be cristendome*, serve to shed some light on Wulfstan's methods of composition and revision. That Wulfstan intended them to be added to the English homily is unquestionable, for they appear in his own handwriting as a marginal addition in I, to be inserted directly before a quotation from Matthew 3: 2 that occurs in all four manuscripts of the Old English homily: *Penitentiam agite; adpropinquabit uobis regnum celorum* (Bethurum 206/115–16, 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand'). The words introducing the quotation in B, C, and E, *ealswa þæt godspel cwæð* ('the Gospel also says') have been erased in I to allow for the addition of the marginalia, which ends with a Latin introduction to the quotation from Matthew: *In euangelio enī scriptū est. penitentiam agite & rel.* ('For it is written in the Gospel, repent, etc.'). The C scribe, perhaps not realizing that the Latin text in (the margin of?) his exemplar was not also biblical,⁹⁵ retained the Old English introductory phrase before inserting the Latin sentences, thus conflating the passage from Ælfric with the quotation from Matthew. Most likely the E scribe recognized that the additional sentences were not biblical and, if inserted after the introductory phrase, would produce a confusing conflation. Bethurum and Napier, following E, omit the marginal addition from their editions of the Old English homily, printing the lines instead as a textual variant.⁹⁶

The sequence of composition in the homilies thus appears to be as follows: Wulfstan wrote *De cristianitate* without the lines from Ælfric's *De consuetudine*, which may or may not have been copied into one of the 'commonplace book' manuscripts at the time of the Latin homily's composition. Following what was clearly his habit, he then used *De cristianitate* as an outline for *Her ongynð be cristendome*, and sometime later decided to incorporate the quotation from Ælfric, which he wrote into the margin of the Old English homily in I and most likely into the margin of a now-lost version of the Latin homily as well. The B text of *Her ongynð be cristendome* would suggest that the English homily was already in circulation when Wulfstan made the addition, as that text lacks any indication of the lines. It is likely that further revision would have included translating the lines for the Old English sermon, as Wulfstan rarely includes non-biblical Latin quotations in his vernacular homilies, but we have no evidence that the homily was revised again – perhaps Wulfstan would have provided an impromptu translation were he to preach the sermon before a formal revision was completed.

What is most interesting is that, as the C and E texts show, the Latin homily was revised as well, most likely through the same sort of marginal addition. Assuming that Wulfstan himself originally made the addition, it would seem

⁹⁵ See Bethurum, p. 18.

⁹⁶ Bethurum, p. 206; Napier, p. 71. Napier omits the final sentence of the marginalia.

that the Latin homily was more than a simple outline for the vernacular translation. This in turn would provide evidence, in addition to the full sermons attributed to the archbishop by Cross and Hall⁹⁷ that Wulfstan had occasion to preach in Latin as well as in the vernacular, perhaps to monastic or other exclusively clerical audiences. The fact that Wulfstan twice refers to the audience of *De cristianitate* as 'brothers' (*fratres*) strengthens the suggestion that the sermon was designed to be preached to the clergy, while the English *Her ongynd be cristendome* is, as noted earlier, equally clearly addressed to both the clergy and the laity.

In all of the homilies discussed in this chapter so far, Wulfstan has sought to teach his audience what Christianity is; however, the formation of a consciously Christian community would also require a working knowledge of what Christianity is not, something against which Christianity can be measured. That something, for Wulfstan, is summed up in the word 'heathenism' (*hæþendome*, *hæþenscipe*). But although Wulfstan repeatedly exhorts his audience to reject heathenism, it is often difficult to determine from those exhortations the nature or the extent of the heathen practices he has in mind.⁹⁸ Certainly the Scandinavians who settled in the Danelaw in the ninth century were for the most part thoroughgoing pagans, but by the late tenth and early eleventh centuries they had by and large been converted to Christianity. Little is known about the conversion process *per se*,⁹⁹ and scholars differ on the extent to which the descendants of the original settlers had been Christianized as well as converted – that is, how far 'Christian beliefs and practices [had] penetrated into the converted society'¹⁰⁰ – as well as on how tenacious various pagan practices had proved to be. Bethurum speaks confidently of 'paganism at York' and assumes 'a large element in the population that was very imperfectly assimilated into Christian institutions'; she adds that it is necessary to distinguish between 'those who recognized the church's authority and those nominal Christians who because of their barbarian background did not'.¹⁰¹ Whitelock refers to Northumbria as 'an unruly area' and asserts that 'Even by the eleventh century heathen practices had not entirely been eradicated'.¹⁰² On the other hand, Judith Jesch cautions that 'Just because Wulfstan felt the need to fulminate against heathen

⁹⁷ Thomas N. Hall, 'Wulfstan's Latin Sermons', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 93–139; Cross, 'A Newly Identified Manuscript'; and 'Contents of the Manuscript', in James E. Cross, and J. Morrish Tunberg, eds., *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection: Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek GL. Kgl. Sam. 1595, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 25* (Copenhagen: Roskilde and Bagger, 1993), pp. 14–23.

⁹⁸ For a good discussion of what 'heathenism' meant to the Anglo-Saxons in general and to Wulfstan in particular, see Audrey L. Meaney, 'Old English Legal and Penitential Penalties for "Heathenism"', in *Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006), pp. 127–58.

⁹⁹ Dorothy Whitelock calls it 'one of the most obscure matters of Anglo-Saxon history' in 'Some Anglo-Saxon Bishops of London', in her *History, Law and Literature in 10th–11th Century England* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1981), II, p. 17. See also Abrams, 'The Conversion of the Danelaw', p. 32.

¹⁰⁰ Abrams, 'The Conversion of the Danelaw', p. 31.

¹⁰¹ Bethurum, pp. 103, 72.

¹⁰² Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, p. 15.

practices does not necessarily mean that they really happened; or if they did, that they were particularly widespread or a real problem', pointing to the 'possible influence on Wulfstan of continental law-codes that similarly banned heathendom'.¹⁰³ And as Audrey Meaney points out in a recent survey of the evidence, 'it was not the pagans whom Wulfstan accused of "heathenism", but unworthy Christians'.¹⁰⁴ Under this head is included not only those who conduct 'rituals at secret shrines', but also those indulging in 'crimes, anti-social behavior [and] sexual misconduct', including 'killers, adulterers, misers, . . . and those who hated monasteries'.¹⁰⁵

Napier homily 60, a brief homiletic passage extant only in Y and rubricated *Be hæðendome*, illustrates Meaney's point. The text can be dated relatively precisely as having been written after 1020 but before Wulfstan's death in 1023.¹⁰⁶ It begins with a quotation from the *Excerptiones pseudo-Ecgberti*, Wulfstan's canon law collection: *Nemo cristianorum paganas superstitiones intendat, sed gentilium inquinamenta omnia omnino contemnat* (Napier 309/11–12, 'None of the Christians should pay heed to pagan superstitions, but rather despise the iniquities of the gentiles in all ways'). Above *Nemo cristianorum* the phrase *vel nullus cristianus* ('or no Christian') has been written in the Wulfstan hand; it is most likely intended as a replacement rather than an addition to *nemo cristianorum* in order to make the construction less clumsy.¹⁰⁷ The passage goes on to condemn heathenism and heathen practices (*heðendom begange*, Napier 309/16–17) in general and the worship of idols (*idola*, 309/17) in particular, with the portion of the sentence prescribing penalties for such offenses marked for omission.¹⁰⁸ What follows is a series of sentences based on the various redactions of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* comprising versions of Wulfstan's well-known lists of sinners and sins, including all those mentioned by Meaney.

The question remains open, however, whether Wulfstan intended those lists to be a summation of what heathenism entailed, or whether they were simply part of what Ker has called 'a considered statement of what Wulfstan thought was vitally important for the spiritual welfare of his clergy and people'.¹⁰⁹ Napier 61, the companion piece that follows *Be hæðendome* in Y rubricated *Be cristendome*, is in no way a summation of what Christianity entails, being entirely concerned with various church dues and the days of

¹⁰³ Jesch, 'Scandinavians and "Cultural Paganism" in Late Anglo-Saxon England', p. 65; cf. Patrick Wormald, 'Æthelred the Lawmaker', in *Æthelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*, ed. D. Hill (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1978), pp. 71–2.

¹⁰⁴ Meaney, "'And we forbeodað'", p. 462.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 499. See also Jesch, 'Scandinavians and "Cultural Paganism" in Late Anglo-Saxon England', p. 65: "'Heathen" may just have been Wulfstan's shorthand for all the sins and moral shortcomings of which he particularly disapproved'.

¹⁰⁶ Ker, 'Handwriting', p. 330.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 331.

¹⁰⁸ . . . and, se ðe to gelome þæt unriht begange, gylde mid Englum swa wer, swa wite, and on Dena lage lahslice, be ðam þe seo dæd sy ('and, he who too often practices that wrong, must pay wergild among the English as a fine, and in the Danelaw the fine for breaking the law, according to what the deed is'). See Ker, 'Handwriting', pp. 318–19; Meaney, "'And we forbeodað'", pp. 482–3.

¹⁰⁹ Ker, 'Handwriting', p. 330.

their payment. Elsewhere in the homilies Wulfstan is more specific about the nature of pagan practices: *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi* mentions giving offerings (*ælmessan*, Bethurum 148/86) to a spring or rock (*wylle oððon stane*, 148/86), while *Sermo de baptisate* forbids the worship (*weorðian*, 184/167) of springs and trees and condemns various forms of witchcraft and augury: *ne gyman ge galdra ne idelra hwata, ne wigelunga ne wiccecræfta* (184/165–6, ‘do not pay heed either to spells or idle divination, nor to sorceries or witchcraft’).

Less helpful in discovering Wulfstan’s practical knowledge of paganism or the extent to which such practices were carried out in his sees is his rewriting of a portion of Ælfric’s homily *De falsis diis*, despite the promise of the rubric. Wulfstan’s text (Bethurum XII; Napier 18) is extant only in E, with the rubric *De falsis deis*; Ælfric’s sermon, by contrast, survives in whole or in part in seven manuscripts,¹¹⁰ the most complete version being that found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 178. As John C. Pope has demonstrated, however, this text, along with that found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116, contains variant readings that are not Ælfric’s and must have come from ‘an ancestor that had deliberately introduced unauthorized additions’.¹¹¹ The fact that Wulfstan’s version shares those readings would indicate that the archbishop used either Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 178 or an immediate precursor¹¹² and by implication that he was familiar with the entire sermon. Wulfstan’s text lacks his standard opening formula *Leofan men*, beginning instead with the interjection *Eala*, as does Ælfric’s homily after its initial Latin quotation, followed by a newly composed sentence introducing the subject of heathenism; it ends with a new concluding paragraph, part of which is based on Ælfric’s introduction to the homily, and part of which is taken from Wulfstan’s own *De fide catholica*. Otherwise Wulfstan changes Ælfric’s text only stylistically, adding intensifiers, changing the rhythm and alliteration, and adding a second word to Ælfric’s one to create doublets such as *gescop 7 geworhte* (Bethurum 221/15–16, ‘created and made’).¹¹³

As noted earlier, Wulfstan uses only a small part of Ælfric’s text, about one-sixth of the whole, a section that is concerned, albeit peripherally, with the Scandinavian gods. The passage deals primarily with the euhemerization of the Roman gods, who are described as exceptionally cruel, violent, and

¹¹⁰ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 178 and 303; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116; Cambridge, University Library, II.I.33; London, British Library, Cotton Julius E.vii and Vespasian D.xiv; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 7585. For the homily, see Pope, *Homilies of Ælfric*, II, pp. 667–724.

¹¹¹ Pope, *Homilies of Ælfric*, II, p. 675. Pope suggests, moreover, that the variations could have been Wulfstan’s, entered into his own early copy of Ælfric’s text and making their way into later copies of Ælfric’s sermon.

¹¹² Bethurum notes (p. 333n) that Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178 ‘may have been in the [Worcester] Cathedral library in Wulfstan’s time’. Godden concedes that ‘the presumed date of the script just about allows that possibility’, but prefers the conclusion that Wulfstan’s used ‘an earlier copy of the collection that survives in Corpus 178’, in ‘The Relations of Wulfstan and Ælfric: A Reassessment’, in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 353–74, at p. 367.

¹¹³ See Bethurum, p. 32; Meaney, ‘“And we forbeodað”’, pp. 463–6. For the view that Wulfstan’s changes reflect a ‘cluttering up of Ælfric’s carefully pared and often chiasitic style’, see Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, p. 75.

lustful human beings in life, and who were worshiped after their deaths *purh deofles lare* (Bethurum, 221/17, 'through the devil's teachings'). The passage equates Jove with Þórr and Mercury with Óðinn. Perhaps most satisfying to Wulfstan and Ælfric, if somewhat disconcerting for modern readers familiar with both mythologies, is the assumption of the inherent superiority of literate education over living tradition in the homily's assertion that certain Danes contend that Jove (i.e., Þórr) is the son of Mercury (i.e., Óðinn), *ac hi nabbað na riht, forðan þe we rædað on bocum, ge on hæpenum ge on Cristenum, þæt se hetula lous to soðan is Saturnes sunu* (223/74–7, 'but they do not have it right, because we read in books, both heathen and Christian, that the hateful Jove is truly Saturn's son').

Despite its almost total reliance on Ælfric, Wulfstan's text has come in for its share of criticism: Bethurum calls it 'cool and unimpassioned' by comparison to the archbishop's other denunciations of paganism,¹¹⁴ while Clare Lees terms it a 'productive misreading' of Ælfric's homily.¹¹⁵ Lees's argument is that by taking a portion of Ælfric's sermon out of context, Wulfstan 'removes from Ælfric's text its structure of salvation history and its revelation of the true by knowledge of the false', thus shifting the focus of the homily away from the one true God to 'the relation between idolatry, paganism, and the devil'.¹¹⁶ The difference is a reflection of the two homilists' contrasting interests and intentions in composing their sermons: while Ælfric is concerned with teaching salvation history and making a theological point, Wulfstan is primarily interested in examining the moral failures of paganism. Lees's argument has merit, but she fails to see that in the context of his other sermons Wulfstan, like Ælfric before him, is also interested in revealing truth through an examination of its opposite; the relationship between the two is implicit in Wulfstan's text. In essence, Lees's discussion mimics Ælfric's rhetorical strategy by using Wulfstan's 'false', that is, misread, text to reveal Ælfric's 'true' meaning; she thereby creates her own 'productive misreading' of Wulfstan's homily by arguing as if the archbishop had intended to rewrite Ælfric's text in its entirety but had somehow misunderstood.

Lees concedes that Wulfstan's text is 'also a response to the external threat of a competing belief system'¹¹⁷ in a way that Ælfric's sermon is not. However, given the apparent lack of devotions in England's northern provinces to the Danish gods *per se*¹¹⁸ (as opposed to divination or offerings at sacred wells, trees, and rocks), it would seem that the worship of such gods as Þórr and Óðinn would not have been Wulfstan's primary concern in combating heathenism. Moreover, Wulfstan's failure to alter Ælfric's Norwegian spelling of the names – *þor* and *oðon* – to their Danish forms¹¹⁹ could suggest that he was in

¹¹⁴ Bethurum, p. 334. Although Bethurum would surely not fall into this category, one is reminded of Orchard's comment about scholars who 'allow [Wulfstan] a maximum of two voices: loud and louder' ('Re-editing Wulfstan', p. 64).

¹¹⁵ Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, p. 71.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 72, 73.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

¹¹⁸ Meaney, "'And we forbeodað'", p. 469.

¹¹⁹ For discussions of the spelling, see Meaney, "'And we forbeodað'", p. 466; also Matthew

fact relatively unfamiliar with their Danish counterparts, that his revision of Ælfric's text was incomplete, or both. It is also possible, given the lack of Wulfstan's introductory *Leofan men*, that the archbishop intended the extant text to become part of a larger homily: although he frequently uses the word *eala* for emphasis or to introduce new subjects in his sermons,¹²⁰ he does not begin any other homily in this way.

The influence of Ælfric's homily can be seen in Wulfstan's addition of the worship of 'the sun or moon, fire or flood' to his definition of heathenism in II Cnut 5.2, his most explicit passage on the subject:

Hæðenscipe byð þæt man idola weorðige, þæt is, þæt man weorpige hæðene godas 7 sunnan oððe monan, fyr oððe flod, wæterwyllas oððe stanas oððe æniges cynnes wudutreowa, oððan wiccecræft lufige, oððon morðweorc gefremme on ænige wisan, oððon on blote oððon fyrhte, oððan swylca gedwimera ænig þinge dreoge.¹²¹

Heathenism is that one worships idols, that is, that one worships heathen gods and the sun or the moon, fire or flood, water-springs or rocks or any type of forest-tree, or loves witchcraft, or brings about murder in any way, or takes part in sacrifice or in divination, or in any such delusions.

Ælfric describes the beginnings of heathenism in a passage that closely follows his own source, Martin of Braga (Pope 680/82–681/88).¹²²

Hi namon þa [to] wisdome þæt hi wurpdon him for godas þa sunnan and þone monan, for heora scinendan beorhtnysse . . . Sume hi gelyfdon on fyr for his færlicum bryne, sume eac on wæter, and wurðodan hi [for godas].

They took it as wisdom that they should worship as gods the sun and the moon for their shining brightness . . . Certain [people] believed in fire for its sudden burning, certain ones also in water, and worshiped them as gods.

Clearly, Wulfstan's use of Ælfric – and thus Martin of Braga – as a source calls into question whether the worship of celestial bodies or the elements could be actually have been found in any part of late Anglo-Saxon England;¹²³ by extension, it also casts doubt on how far any of the practices named were actually carried out. Organized cult centers for the worship of the Norse gods do not appear to have existed in Wulfstan's time, although private devotions in isolated areas would have been possible; in addition, animal sacrifices carried out in rural farmhouses as part of the kind of Scandinavian *blót* described in *Egils saga* and *Víga-Glúms saga*¹²⁴ would at least seem plausible,

Townend, *Language and History in Viking Age England: Linguistic Relations between Speakers of Old Norse and Old English* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), p. 139.

¹²⁰ See, for example, *Secundum Lucam*, Bethurum 126/74; *Secundum Marcum*, 137/53; *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi*, 150/214; *De fide catholica*, 161/104, 163/142.

¹²¹ Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, pp. 312–13.

¹²² *Alii adorabunt solem, alii lunam uel stellas, uel ignem, alii aquam profundam* ('Some worshiped the sun, others the moon or stars, or fire, others deep water'); cited in Bethurum, p. 334n.

¹²³ But see Bethurum, p. 335n.

¹²⁴ See *Egils saga Skalla-Grimsson*, ed. Sigurður Nordal, Íslenzk fornrit 2 (Reykjavík: Hið íslenzka fornritafélag, 1933), ch. 44; *Víga-Glúms saga*, in *Eyfirðinga sögur*, ed. Jónas Kristjánsson, Íslenzk fornrit 9 (Reykjavík: Hið íslenzka fornritafélag, 1956), ch. 6.

despite the lack of positive evidence. Murder through occult means was probably attempted. More importantly, the fact that witchcraft, divination, and devotions at springs, rocks, and trees recur in both the homilies and the law codes would suggest that Wulfstan believed these practices to be at least somewhat common. These latter practices might be better classified as 'superstition' rather than reflexes of Scandinavian paganism; they could be, and no doubt were, carried out by Anglo-Saxons of both English and Danish descent who considered themselves Christians.¹²⁵ Wulfstan's denunciations of 'heathenism' were aimed primarily at just such people, far more than at Anglo-Scandinavians practicing the religion of their ancestors – if in fact any still existed within the Danelaw. If some Anglo-Saxons saw no contradiction between traditional superstitious practices and Christianity, Wulfstan was determined to teach them the fundamental incompatibility of the two.

Wulfstan's homilies on the basic tenets of the Christian faith, albeit not as extensive as Ælfric's, demonstrate the archbishop's intentions to provide both clergy and laity with a working knowledge of the fundamentals of Christianity: an outline of salvation history, the Pater Noster and Creed, the ten commandments and eight capital sins, and the dangers of pagan practices. Still, eschatology and Antichrist are never far from Wulfstan's mind in these sermons; it is his conviction that the world is in haste that compels him to place the greatest emphasis on the basic beliefs necessary for salvation and the moral imperatives that will enable his constituency to reject *deofles lare* ('the devil's teachings') in a world that he was convinced was nearing its final days.

¹²⁵ For a thorough discussion of such practices, see Meaney, "And we forbeodað", pp. 486–99.

Wulfstan as Archbishop

AN ANGLO-SAXON ARCHBISHOP was responsible for supervising the priests and bishops of his sees, calling and presiding over ecclesiastical synods, administering church lands, attending meetings of the king's *witan*, and performing a wide range of liturgical functions, some of which were common to all priests or to other bishops, and some of which were reserved to the archbishop alone. The scope of an archbishop's liturgical functions can best be seen by looking at the various *ordines* found in Anglo-Saxon pontificals: these include directions for the ordination of priests, deacons, and others in lower orders; for the consecration of bishops, abbots, and abbesses, as well as churches, altars, relics, cemeteries, and chrism; for administering the sacraments of baptism and confirmation; for pontifical blessings at the time of communion; and for services to be performed on specific occasions (such as the visitation of the sick or the burial of the dead) or particular days (primarily Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, Maundy Thursday, and the Easter vigil).¹ Although Wulfstan most likely owned and used more than one pontifical during the course of his thirty-year episcopal career, only one can be positively identified with him owing to the presence of corrections in the Wulfstan hand: the Claudius Pontifical I,² extant in London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A.iii. As it stands, the manuscript is incomplete, with its quires no longer arranged in their original order;³ however, even in its original, unaltered form, many of the pontifical's texts seem to have been missing, severely abbreviated,⁴ or 'already outdated when copied'.⁵ It is therefore extremely unlikely that Wulfstan ever used this manuscript as a practical service book. A better candidate is the Egbert Pontifical (Paris,

¹ Richard P. Pfaff, *The Anglo-Saxon Bishop and his Book*, Toller Memorial Lecture, repr. from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 81 (1999), 3–24 (Manchester: Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, nd), p. 9.

² Ker, item 141; Gneuss 314. Wulfstan's pontifical, contained on fols. 31–86 and 106–50, is generally termed 'Claudius Pontifical I' to distinguish it from two later pontificals bound with it in the manuscript. See D. H. Turner, ed., *The Claudius Pontificals*, Henry Bradshaw Society 97 (London, 1971). For further discussion of the pontifical's contents, see Christopher A. Jones, 'Wulfstan's Liturgical Interests', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 334–46; for the relationship of Claudius I to other benedictionals, see Andrew Prescott, 'The Structure of English Pre-Conquest Benedictionals', *British Library Journal* 13 (1987), 118–58.

³ Ker, item 141, pp. 177–8.

⁴ See Jones, 'Wulfstan's Liturgical Interests', pp. 334–46, for abbreviations; Wormald points out that while 'an archbishop's book should have contained the rite for the consecration of bishops . . . "Claudius I" did not', *Making of English Law*, p. 194.

⁵ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, p. 194.

Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 10575), which Christopher Jones has suggested may have been owned by Wulfstan, largely on the basis of two texts otherwise extant in manuscripts associated with the archbishop: the *Eclogae de ordine Romano* and a rare *ordo* for a chrism mass extant in both W and (in truncated form) the Claudius Pontifical I.⁶

Given the extent of an archbishop's liturgical duties, very few of Wulfstan's extant homilies stem from specifically liturgical occasions. Excluding the sermons on baptism and public penance examined in Chapter 6, there are only two: *De dedicatione ecclesiae*, for the consecration of a church, and *Lectio secundum Lucam*, for the consecration of a bishop. The latter text is bound up with Wulfstan's prescriptive and theoretical writings about the secular clergy in general, found in the *Canons of Edgar*, the chapters on the duties and behavior of bishops and priests in the *Institutes of Polity*, a Latin outline and English homily on the subject of negligent priests, and homiletic fragments incorporated into the *Institutes of Polity* in G.

De dedicatione ecclesiae, Wulfstan's sermon for the consecration of a church (Bethurum XVIII; Napier 54), is in large part a condensation of Ælfric's *In dedicatione ecclesiae*;⁷ unfortunately, it is probably Wulfstan's least successful reworking of one of Ælfric's sermons. The text is extant only in N, although its final lines are found in F as the conclusion of an unedited, non-Wulfstanian homily also on the dedication of a church and rubricated *Item alia*.⁸ Bethurum accepts the sermon as Wulfstan's, but considers it problematic, noting that the rhythm of the sentences is 'not quite like his writing' and that the majority of the text is 'remarkably free of rhetorical features'.⁹ She therefore suggests that it was 'produced hastily', possibly as a result of Cnut's desire to have the archbishop consecrate the church built in commemoration of the Ashingdon victory in 1020.¹⁰ While it is impossible to tie the sermon to a particular occasion on internal evidence, Bethurum's points about the stylistic features of the homily are well taken. Yet the text shows fewer signs of haste than of a workmanlike job done on a subject that perhaps interested the archbishop less than others and thus did not receive the full rhetorical development for which he is known.

Both Ælfric and Wulfstan compare the consecration of contemporary churches to the dedication of Solomon's temple at Jerusalem in 2 Chronicles; Wulfstan follows his usual custom of stripping Ælfric's text of its narrative detail, incorporating new material, and altering the focus of the homily to

⁶ Jones, 'Wulfstan's Liturgical Interests', p. 343. Gneuss 896 gives the manuscript's provenance as Évreux; for the suggestion that it should be attributed to Worcester, see David Dumville, 'Anglo-Saxon Books: Treasure in Norman Hands?', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 16 (1994), 83–99, at p. 95.

⁷ *Catholic Homilies* II.40. See Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Second Series*, pp. 335–45.

⁸ See Wilcox, 'Dissemination', p. 212; Bethurum, p. 354. As Donald Scragg has noted, the unedited homily is lacking a Cameron number of its own, having been assimilated into Wulfstan's *De dedicatione ecclesiae* in Cameron's listing as B.2.3.6; see 'The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric', *Anglo-Saxon England* 8 (1979), p. 255n.

⁹ Bethurum, p. 35.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

emphasize the elements of Ælfric's sermon he finds most important. Thus he omits Ælfric's account of Solomon's dream-conversation with God, stating simply that Solomon in his youth asked God for wisdom; also omitted are Ælfric's explanations of the magnitude of Solomon's wealth and his offerings at the temple, the specifics of the temple's size, and the entire episode of the queen of Sheba's visit to the king, along with most of Ælfric's extended exegesis of the components of the narrative. The exegesis that remains is drastically simplified: whereas Ælfric equates Solomon with peace according to the Hebrew etymology of the name ('peaceful'), and cites both Ephesians 2: 14 (*ipse est pax nostra*, Godden 337/80, 'for he is our peace') and John 14: 27 (*Pacem relinquo uobis. Pacem meam do uobis*, Godden 337/83–4, 'I leave peace with you; I give you my peace') to establish Solomon as a type of Christ, Wulfstan states simply that *se eorðlica cyning Salomon getacnað þæne heofenlican cyning*, *þæt is, Crist sylfne* (Bethurum 247/66–248/67, 'the earthly king Solomon signifies the heavenly king, that is, Christ himself'). Likewise, whereas Ælfric references Peter on Christ as the rejected stone that becomes the cornerstone on which the church is built, *na mid deadum stanum. ac mid lybbendum sawlum* (Godden 338/92–3, 'not with dead stones, but with living souls'; 1 Peter 2: 5–7), Wulfstan is content to make a simple equation between the material church and the spiritual: *þæt an hus þe he arærde Gode to lofe of eorðlican antimbre, þæt getacnað þa halgan ecclesiam þe Crist getimbrode of gastlicum andweorce* (Bethurum 278/67–9, 'the one house that [Solomon] built for the praise of God out of earthly materials, that signifies the holy *ecclesia* that Christ built of spiritual materials'). Having omitted the story of the queen of Sheba, Wulfstan cannot follow Ælfric in his interpretation of the queen as a type of the whole church; instead, he draws a somewhat shaky analogy between the people attending the dedication of Solomon's temple and all church-going Christians.

Both homilists remind their audiences that the human body is also a temple of God, into which the Holy Spirit enters at baptism, taking up its dwelling within the human heart; again Wulfstan eschews Ælfric's quotations from scripture and the metaphor of souls as living stones for a simple statement of equivalence. At the same time, however, he sharpens and personalizes Ælfric's admonition to beware the devil's lies in order to become a dwelling worthy of God: Wulfstan states baldly that if a person *purh deofles lare hine sylfne wið God forsyngað 7 leahtras lufað, þonne forlæt se Halga Gast þa onwununge, 7 þær sona wyrð deofol inne* (Bethurum 248/80–2, 'through the devil's teachings sins against God and loves lies, then the Holy Spirit forsakes the dwelling, and there immediately the devil enters'). The series of moral admonitions that follow – to purify one's heart, to love God and keep his commandments, to seek to know how to please God – are an expansion rather than a condensation of Ælfric's text.

Wulfstan returns to 2 Chronicles 6 for his summary of the dedication itself, rather than relying exclusively on Ælfric's account. Moreover, he adds an extended paragraph on the proper behavior of church-goers, admonishing his listeners that they should always enter the church *mid miclum Godes ege 7 þær geornlice to Gode clypie 7 his mildheortnesse bidde* (Bethurum 247/40–2, 'with great fear of God and there earnestly call out

to God and ask his mercy'), emphasizing that the only appropriate action in church is *God to herianne 7 hine to gebiddanne* (247/50, 'to praise God and pray to him'), and condemning idleness in word and deed as service to the devil: *se þe þær deð ænig unnyt wordes oððon weorces, he dryhð deofles willan 7 abelhð his Drihtne swiðor þonne he beþorfte* (247/48–9, 'he who uses vain words or does useless actions there, he does the will of the devil and angers his lord more than he needs'). It may be that Wulfstan intended the paragraph in part as an extension of the analogy between the material church and the body as a temple of God, with the proper outward behavior mirroring the proper inward behavior of a good Christian. If so, the analogy is never made explicitly and is thus largely lost.

By way of contrast, *Lectio secundum Lucam* (Bethurum XVII; Napier 37), Wulfstan's homily for the consecration of a bishop, indicates that he put a great deal of thought and effort into his words for such occasions. Wulfstan's writings on bishops include many non-homiletic texts: the immediate predecessors of this sermon comprise two related works concerning the duties and behavior of priests in general and of bishops in particular. The three texts taken together once again reflect Wulfstan's customary procedure of first compiling a set of Latin quotations on a subject; then translating selections from these into English, augmented by further quotations or by his own writing; and finally composing a longer, more developed homily making use of both the Latin and English texts. In this case, Wulfstan's Latin compilation (Bethurum XVIa) is extant only in I, where it is rubricated *Verba Ezechielis prophete de pastoribus non recta agentibus* ('the words of the prophet Ezekiel concerning negligent priests') and accompanied by two other tracts concerning the priesthood and preaching.¹¹ The excerpts cited are taken not only from Ezekiel 33–4, but also from Isaiah 56, Halitgar's *Penitential*, a letter from Boniface to Archbishop Cuthbert (including a reference to John 10: 12), and one of Gregory the Great's homilies.¹² All of the quotations are concerned with the clerical responsibility to preach to the faithful as the most effective means of protecting them from evil and with the consequences that will ensue if priests are negligent. As was also Wulfstan's custom, when he composed his English translation of the Latin excerpts (Bethurum XVIb; Napier 41) he made use of both the excerpts and the original sources, beginning the English translation with a further quotation from Ezekiel 34 omitted in the Latin text.

The translation is extant in C, where it is rubricated *Verba Ezechiel prophete de pigris aut timidis vel negligentibus pastoribus* ('the words of the prophet Ezekiel concerning sluggish or timid and negligent priests'). Like the Latin

¹¹ Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, p. 63. The accompanying texts are rubricated *De veneratio[n]e . . . sacerdotum* (? the script is illegible) and *De pastore et predatore*; the second of these is also extant in W and X.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 65–7, see especially p. 66, note 9; Bethurum, p. 349. For Boniface, see A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, eds., *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869–78), III, pp. 376–7; for Gregory, see *XL Homiliarum in Evangelia I*, homily 17 (PL 76, 1151, C).

compilation, the translation may best be described as comprising notes for a future sermon, as it is not in itself a homily.¹³ Forgoing his usual homiletic opening *Leofan men*, Wulfstan begins the text with a simple sentence to introduce the quotations: *Ezechiel se witega lærð Godes bydelas þæt hi beorgan heom silfum wið Godes yrrre* (Bethurum 240/5–6, ‘The prophet Ezekiel taught God’s preachers to protect themselves against God’s anger’); this is followed by the translated excerpts, linked together by the phrase *he cwæð* (‘he said’), and a single clause to note the change of speaker: *Ealswa Issaias se witega hwilum be þam spræc* (240/22, ‘Also the prophet Isaiah spoke at times about them’). Bethurum ends her printed text with a Latin benediction – *Sit nomen Domini benedictum ex hoc nunc et usque in seculum* (241/37–8, ‘May the name of the Lord be blessed from this [point] now and to eternity’) – that as she notes is ‘a favourite ending of the C scribe’¹⁴ and was therefore not part of the original text, since Wulfstan’s own homiletic conclusions are consistently in English rather than Latin. Although noting that there is a half line left empty after the benediction in the manuscript,¹⁵ Napier adds four lines of text that follow: *Nu ne dear ic for godes ege soðes geswugian; ac licige, swa hit licige, soð ic wille secgan, gyme se ðe wille. Forðam se bydel, þe ne bodað na his hlafordes gewilboda, a he mæg him wenan hetelices leanes* (191/20–3, ‘Now I do not dare for fear of God to keep silent; but let it please as it pleases, I will tell the truth, pay heed who will. Because the preacher who does not preach his lord’s commandments may always expect for himself a hateful reward’). These lines recur in E as part of another short passage preceding the second half of *Lectio secundum Lucam*, indicating that they are in some way connected to this series of texts. It is possible that the lines were a marginal addition in the CE exemplar and perhaps originally comprised part of a working draft of either the vernacular translation of the *Verba Ezeziel* or *Lectio secundum Lucam* itself.

As Jonathan Wilcox has demonstrated in some detail, the English version of the *Verba Ezeziel* is much more than a literal translation of the Latin.¹⁶ Rather, Wulfstan uses the Latin excerpts to create a rhetorical *tour de force* of alliteration, consonance, repetition, and onomatopoeia that can stand with the best of his writing and that he reused both in *Lectio secundum Lucam* and in the chapters on bishops in the *Institutes of Polity*. The citations from Ezekiel employ the well-worn metaphor of the priest as shepherd of his flock, here combined with a similar usage from John 10: 12 found in Boniface’s letter to Cuthbert. Bethurum suggests that the analogy may still have been ‘a very rich figure in the eleventh century’,¹⁷ and Wulfstan enlivens the metaphor further with the striking image of the *wod-fræca werewolf* (Bethurum 241/35, ‘madly ravenous werewolf’) threatening the flock. The compound *werewolf* is unique in Old English to Wulfstan’s

¹³ Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, p. 69; Wilcox, ‘The Wolf on Shepherds’, p. 398.

¹⁴ Bethurum, p. 351.

¹⁵ Napier, *Wulfstan*, p. 191n.

¹⁶ Wilcox, ‘The Wolf on Shepherds’, pp. 399–400.

¹⁷ Bethurum, p. 350.

writings;¹⁸ however, it would have been immediately comprehensible to an Anglo-Saxon audience as a kenning for the wolf who preys on men, thereby effectively extending and enhancing the pastoral analogy. At the same time, the image of a wolf in the shape of a man may also have been evoked in the minds of some listeners, thus reinforcing the idea of the *werewolf* as an image of *se deofol silf* (241/30, 'the devil himself') or perhaps of Antichrist, a figure never far from Wulfstan's mind.

A second, less favorable metaphor for the clergy is found in the excerpt cited from Isaiah: *canes muti non ualentes latrare* (Bethurum 240/23, 'mute dogs cannot bark', Isaiah 56: 10), translated as *gemidlede hundas ne beorcað to nahte* (240/24, 'muzzled dogs bark at nothing'), perhaps to emphasize that a priest who is silent in the face of sin is not simply mute; rather, he is muzzled by his own *ege oððe lufe oððe . . . worldscame* (240/25, 'terror or love or . . . worldly shame'). Wulfstan skillfully combines the two metaphors to make his most important point: just as a watchdog is useless unless it barks at every danger, just as shepherds are negligent if they are not *swiðe wacole 7 geornlice clipigende* (241/32, 'very wakeful and earnestly crying out') at the approach of the wolf, so priests are both useless and negligent if they *clummiað mid ceaflum þar hi scoldan clipian* (240/21–2), a phrase often translated as 'mumble in their jaws when they should cry out', but which has a literal meaning of 'keep silent with their jaws', – a more appropriate translation in this instance, where the priests are compared to mute dogs and sleeping shepherds. Both the images and the alliterative translations recur in Wulfstan's writings on bishops in the *Institutes of Polity*.¹⁹

Lectio secundum Lucam is extant in two different versions in E and N. E splits the text into two sections, with the latter part of the sermon coming first: item 29 of the manuscript begins on fol. 83^v with three introductory sentences, dismissed by Bethurum as 'not in this homily'²⁰ despite their clear relevance to the subject matter that follows: *Eala leofan men swytele is gesyne, þæt we nabbað na gehealden, swa swa we scoldan, þæt, þæt we behetan, þa we fulluht underfengon. Nu ne deær ic for godes ege soðes geswugian; ac licige, swa hit licige, soð ic wille secgan, gyme se ðe wille. Forðam se bydel, þe ne bodað na his hlaforðes gewilboda, a he mæg him wenan hetelices leanes* (Napier 177n; 'Oh beloved people, it is clearly seen that we do not keep that which we promised when we received baptism as well as we should. Now I do not dare for fear of God to keep silent; but let it please as it pleases, I will tell the truth, pay heed who will. Because the preacher who does not preach his lord's commandments may always expect for himself a hateful reward'). The second sentence is the same as that found at the end of the English translation of the *Verba Ezekiel* in C; if one places these sentences in the context of the complete sermon, they fall directly after Wulfstan's explanation of the history of the episcopate and precede his description of the proper behavior of a bishop, which follows after an intervening rubric, *Be*

¹⁸ Wilcox, 'The Wolf on Shepherds', p. 400.

¹⁹ See *ibid.*, pp. 400–4.

²⁰ Bethurum, p. 243n. She does not print the sentences.

godes bydelum ('concerning God's preachers'). The E text breaks off somewhat abruptly on fol. 84^v with the words *lc wat swyðe georne. me sylfne forwyrhtne wordes 7 dæda. ealles to swyðe ealswa ma manna. ne deaƿ þeah for godes ege. forswygian mid ealle. fela þæra þinga. þe dereð þysse þeode* ('I know myself very well to be all too much a sinner in words and deeds, as more men are also, nor do I dare to be silent for fear of God with all the many things that afflict this nation'). Thus not only does item 29 of E lack the beginning of the sermon, it would appear to lack the ending as well, since the final sentence reads like a transition to a new subject rather than the conclusion to what has gone before. Almost ten folios later, at 93^v, another fragmentary text provides the opening section of the sermon. This text is rubricated twice: first with .L. *Lectio secundum Lucam* ('L',²¹ a reading according to Luke'), followed by the Latin text of Luke 24: 49–52, and the rubric *Be biscophadum* ('concerning the office of bishop'), introducing the English homily proper. The text breaks off on fol. 94^v with the abbreviation *&rl* (*et reliqua*, 'and the rest'), apparently because the scribe realized he was recopying an earlier text.

In contrast, N presents the homily as a continuous whole with an extended ending not found in E.²² The text begins, as does the second fragment of the E text, with the rubric *Lectio secundum Lucam* and the excerpt from Luke 24, here breaking off with *et reliqua* after verse 51, followed by the second rubric as in E to introduce the English sermon. N divides the homily visually into two sections by the use of a barred L in dark ink at the left margin to indicate Wulfstan's use of *Leofan men*: the first section concerns bishops in general, the second homiletic exhortations and teachings for both clergy and laity. Each section is also subdivided by content: part one comprises a section on the history of bishops followed by exhortations concerning their behavior without the intervening lines discussed above; part two begins with instructions to the faithful to follow the bishop's teachings even if the bishop himself is a sinner, omits the final lines found in E, continues with a short section addressed to priests, and ends with a series of exhortations to all Christians, each beginning *And we willað læran manna gehwylcne* ('And we want to teach each person'). The homily thus addresses each portion of the congregation in turn, providing instruction for all those likely to attend a bishop's consecration.

Wulfstan begins his history of the order of bishops with an explanation of the pericope from Luke: the risen Christ blessed the apostles to consecrate them as bishops before his ascension into heaven, *þæt hi rihtne cristendom þanonforð georne bodian sceoldon 7 heora æftergengan þæt ylce bebedan* (Bethurum 242/12–14, 'so that they should thenceforth preach correct Christianity and [he] commanded their descendants [to do] the same').

²¹ The 'L.' is somewhat problematic: it could be an abbreviation for *Leofan men*, but the scribe uses a barred L to indicate *Leofan men* throughout the rest of the homily. It could also possibly be an abbreviation of *Lectio*, or the numeral '50'. Both 'L.' and the rubric are in red ink; there is also an 'X.' in black ink in the margin next to the rubric.

²² Bethurum prints a partial version of the homily, ending at the point at which the E text breaks off. Chapter 3 presents the arguments for regarding the N text as Wulfstan's full version of the sermon.

As with the apostles, the primary duty of a bishop is therefore to preach the law of God (*godes riht*, 242/15) and to forbid wrongdoing (*unriht forbēodan*, 242/16). After reminding his audience of the consecration they have just witnessed, Wulfstan traces the order of bishops to the consecration of Aaron by Moses, *se ðe on geardagum be godes agenum dihte rihte lage scyfte* (243/22–3, ‘who in days of yore created correct law according to God’s own words’). Drawing on the English version of *Verba Ezechiel*, he reiterates the admonition that preachers must not ‘keep silent with their jaws where they should cry out’, and then returns to the Latin text to stress that the preacher who is silent will be held accountable for the sins of his flock.²³ In return, the faithful are to obey their bishops, who speak with the authority of Christ and whose decisions will be honored both in heaven and on earth. Yet that authority is a heavy burden (*swær is seo byrðen*, 244/65), and if a bishop is unable to carry that burden without sin, Wulfstan insists, he is still to be obeyed if he preaches God’s law correctly.

The ending of the homily in N broadens the reference of the sermon by conflating the roles of bishops and priests into *þam godcundan hyrdan* (Napier 178/22, ‘the divine shepherds’) who will lead their flocks to judgment on the last day; the metaphor takes Wulfstan back to *Verba Ezechiel* for the final time, in order to reference the passage from John 10: 12 cited by Boniface’s letter to Archbishop Cuthbert about the shepherds who *swa swa hit þearf is, clypian gelome and warnian georne manna gehwylcne* (179/2–3, ‘just as is necessary, cry out often and earnestly warn each person’). Priests and bishops (*godes þeowas*, ‘God’s servants’, 179/4) are to obey the dictates of the rule (*ealle heora wisan regollice fadian*, 179/6–7), that is, *bocum and gebedum geornlice filian and bodian and bysnian godes riht georne and for eal cristen folc þingian gelome* (179/7–8, ‘attend earnestly to books and prayers and preach and set an example of God’s law and intercede often for all Christian people’). The final section is addressed emphatically to the entire congregation – the clause *and we willað læran manna gehwylcne* (‘and we want to teach each person’) is repeated four times – and is no doubt intended to serve as an example (along with the homily as a whole) of the sort of preaching Wulfstan expects his bishops to perform. Its function is twofold: to teach the clergy the art of preaching and to teach Christian morality and behavior to the laity.

The performativity of the sermon is particularly striking. Wulfstan begins by speaking in the voice of all bishops (*we bisceopas*, ‘we bishops’) as he explains the origin of the episcopate both in Christ’s blessing of the apostles and sending them out to preach his word and in Moses’s consecration of Aaron. The reminder of the consecration the congregation has just seen is placed in between. In a performance context, the effect of Wulfstan’s words would have been to cast the archbishop himself into the roles of Christ and of Moses – lawgivers under the new and old laws – reinforced by Wulfstan’s personal role as the creator of the nation’s laws according to the words of the king. It is from this position of rhetorically enhanced authority that Wulfstan

²³ Cf. Ezekiel 33: 8, 3: 18.

pronounces his teachings on the secular clergy, with special attention paid to bishops and the authority that accords to them. Before moving to his teachings for the all people, however, he reminds his audience that he, like all bishops, is not only in a position of authority vis-à-vis the people, but also a member of the larger community and therefore in a position of submission to God: *uton we ealle don swa us þearf is, beorgan us georne wið Godes yrre* ('let us all do as is necessary for us, protect ourselves earnestly against God's anger'). Bishops, like all human beings, are subject to temptation, and if a bishop sins, it is nonetheless necessary that he be obeyed if he teaches God's law correctly. What follows is the teaching of the law itself, introduced repeatedly with the pronoun *we* – perhaps once again with the meaning 'we bishops', but more likely the singular 'we' that it is Wulfstan's custom to use in his homilies. Unusually for Wulfstan, however, he does not end the homily in N with his customary *utan* + infinitive exhortation; rather, he ends with a final sentence beginning *And we willað læran* ('and we want to teach') that advises love for God, *ðam symle sy lof and wyrðmynt æfre to worulde, amen* ('to whom be love and honor always in the world, amen'). Thus the homily ends with Wulfstan still speaking from a stance outside and above the community, thereby emphasizing his authority as archbishop.

By way of contrast, the E text ends on a strikingly personal, even humble note, with the speaker confessing himself in the first-person singular to have sinned *ealles to swyðe, ealswa ma manna* ('all too much, just as more people [have]'), and asking for the audience to listen to his words without anger (*butan gebelge*). Such a statement would obviously clash with the tone of enhanced authority in the sermon as preserved in N; if N represents an expanded, revised text of the homily as found in E, the performativity of the homily goes a long way towards explaining the omission.

As archbishop, Wulfstan would also have written pastoral letters to guide the bishops in his archdioceses; characteristically, the single pastoral letter that survives is composed in homiletic prose, most likely as a model for preaching. Thus, the majority of the text is addressed not only to those in clerical orders or in exalted secular rank, but also to all Christian people. The letter (Bethurum XIII; Napier 19–26) is extant in whole or in part in five manuscripts: B, C, E, K, and M. Three present the text simply as a homily: B is unrubricated; E gives the rubric as *Sermo ad populum*; whereas K is rubricated *To eallum folke*. In M only a few fragmentary sentences survive. Thus the text is designated as a pastoral letter only in C, where it is introduced by a prefatory passage sending Wulfstan's archiepiscopal greetings to *þegnas on ðeode gehadode and læwede* ('thegns in the nation, clerical and lay'). The manuscript history of the text is complicated, but a close examination reveals that the work survives in three distinct stages of transmission: a relatively short, most likely earlier²⁴ homily extant in B, a longer pastoral letter extant in C and E, and what becomes a series of short, often unrelated homiletic fragments in K.²⁵

²⁴ Bethurum, p. 20.

²⁵ For a full discussion and editions of both versions of the text, see Lionarons, 'Textual Identity'.

The B text begins on page 229 of the manuscript at the end of Wulfstan's *Her ongynð be cristendome* (here rubricated *Larspell*) on a new line but with no indication that it is a new text. The last sentence of *Her ongynð be cristendome* is truncated, reading simply *A sy ecum gode lof 7 weorðmynt* ('praise and honor to eternal God always'), without the final words of the closing formula as found in that homily's three other manuscripts: *in ealra worulda world æfre butan ende, amen* ('in the world of all worlds, ever without end, amen'). The pastoral letter/homily itself is divided into two parts: the first comprises lines 1–41 of Bethurum XIII (Napier 19–20), with no manuscript division or marking between the Napier texts. At the bottom of page 237 the manuscript has a rhetorical closing formula similar to that found at the end of the previous homily – *Him simble sy lof and wuldor a in ealra worulda woruld a butan ende; AMEN* ('to him be praise and glory always, in the world of all worlds, always without end, amen') – followed by a clear division and a new rubric, once again *Larspell*. This is followed at the top of page 238 by large, ornate red capitals reading *LEOFAN MEN*. The following text comprises the rest of Bethurum's version of the homily, that is, lines 42–106 (Napier homilies 21–2, again with no manuscript division between the Napier texts). Although Bethurum ends her text here, the manuscript continues on the same line with Napier 23, followed, again with no break, by Napier 24. The ending is marked by the same closing formula cited above and the word *AMEN* spaced across an entire line.

The missing rubric at the beginning of the B text would seem to be a simple scribal error, given that the other manuscripts begin the text with a clear division and either a new rubric or, in the case of C, a passage introducing the work as a pastoral letter. Most likely, the B scribe was copying an exemplar with small, easily overlooked textual divisions and rubrics and simply skipped over a line or two – thus missing out the second half of the closing formula at the end of *Her ongynð be cristendome* along with the following rubric – and continued on into the second homily. The division of the homily into two texts by a new, visually prominent rubric in the middle is more problematic. The other manuscripts (excluding M) divide the work into several smaller sections, each with the rubric *To folce* or a close variant of it, but not into what clearly looks like two discrete homilies. It is of course possible that the B scribe copied his exemplar faithfully; that is, that the exemplar contained the same textual division. More likely, however, based on the evidence of the other manuscripts as well as on the logical continuity of the text as a whole, the scribe recognized his error in missing the initial rubric and, realizing that what he was now copying was a new work, ended with a standard rhetorical closing formula and began again. If that was indeed the case, then the B text may easily be read as a complete manuscript work comprising Napier homilies 19–24, and may be regarded as an early version of the homily that was later reworked into the pastoral letter. Bethurum suggests that the homily may have been composed initially to be preached at a meeting of the *witan* and only later distributed in written form.²⁶

²⁶ Bethurum, p. 339.

The homily is directed to the people and draws heavily on Wulfstan's catechetical sermons.²⁷ The first part (Napier 19) teaches a basic belief in a creator God who has prepared a place for the faithful in heaven and stresses the importance of baptism. Next comes belief in Christ and his resurrection (Napier 20), followed by what the faithful owe to Christ in return for his sacrifice and the impossibility of ever making adequate recompense (Napier 21). These ideas lead inevitably to what the faithful can in fact do, in a section that begins with an account of the proper behavior for a Christian that pays special attention to the payment of tithes and other alms, followed by one of Wulfstan's standard descriptions of hell and its torments, his list of what sort of people will end up in hell, and a series of urgent exhortations concerning correct belief and behavior (Napier 22). The next section (Napier 23) returns to the subject of tithes and alms, using material taken largely from I Cnut to explain the time of year at which each payment is due and the spiritual and earthly penalties to be incurred if the alms are not given, and going on to remind the faithful of the necessity of performing corporal acts of mercy, that is, of feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting the sick, and so forth. The final section (Napier 24) also borrows from I Cnut and discusses the necessity of being loyal to God and one's earthly lord before returning to the subject of baptism and prescribing penalties for priests or parents who fail to baptize a child within thirty days of its birth.²⁸ The homily goes on to compare the birth of Christ to the spiritual birth of the faithful through baptism and to exhort the faithful to remember that a time is coming when body and soul must part, when earthly friends can no longer be of aid, and only God himself will decide the fate of the individual soul. The homily thus proceeds from beginning to end in a logical fashion, with the possible exception of the passage detailing the payment of tithes and alms (Napier 23), which jumps somewhat abruptly back to the subject of tithes after a long excursus on the tortures of hell

C and E preserve virtually the same text, differing substantially only in their rubrics and conclusions. As noted above, E presents the text as a homily with the rubric *Sermo ad populum*, while C designates the work as a pastoral letter. Despite the omission of an initial rubric in C, the beginning of the letter is clearly marked: more than half an inch of blank space precedes Wulfstan's archiepiscopal greeting, which features a large green initial *wyn* whose descender extends a full six lines of text: *Wulfstan arcebisceop. greted̃ freondlice. þegnas on ðeode. gehadode 7 læwede. ealle gemænlice. þa ðe him betæhte sindon. for gode to wissianne. 7 ic bidde eow for godes lufan. þæt ge þises gewrites giman 7 on hwiltidum hit on gemynde habban. forðam þeah ðe hit leohtlic minegung þince. hit is þeah þearflic gime se þe wille.*²⁹ ('Archbishop Wulfstan sends friendly greetings to the thegns in the nation, clerical and lay all together, who are entrusted to

²⁷ See Bethurum's notes for exact correspondences.

²⁸ The penalties are taken from the *Canons of Edgar* 15. B actually states that children must be baptized within seven days of birth; the number is thirty in C, E, and K.

²⁹ Transcription from C, p. 19. Bethurum (p. 225) and Napier (p. 108) each print the greeting as a note to the homily proper.

him to instruct in the sight of God. And I ask you for God's love that you take heed of this writing and have it in mind at times because although you may think it an admonition of little importance, it is nonetheless necessary, take heed who will'). Additional rubrics, each reading *To Folce*, divide the text in both manuscripts into five discrete sections, all but two corresponding to a single Napier homily. Part I, following the rubric *Sermo ad populum* in E and the archiepiscopal greetings in C, comprises lines 1–31 of Bethurum's text and corresponds to Napier 19; Part II, Bethurum lines 32–41 (Napier 20); Part III, Bethurum lines 42–52 (Napier 21). Part IV begins with Bethurum lines 53–106 (Napier 22), then continues, with no break in the manuscript, with lines 1–28 of Napier 24. Part V corresponds for the most part to Napier 25, but concludes with a segue into Bethurum's line 17 of Wulfstan's translation of the Apostles' Creed (Bethurum VIIa; Napier 26): *Ac utan don swa us mycel þearf is. habban anrædne geleafan. 7 ful hiht on urne drihten. 7 se ðe þurh leden lare. rihtne geleafan understandan ne cunne. geleornige huru on englisc 7 cweðe þus gelome. Credimus in unum deum patrem & filium & spiritum sanctum*³⁰ ('But let us do as is greatly necessary for us, have steadfast belief and complete hope in our Lord. And he who cannot understand correct belief through Latin teaching should indeed learn this in English and often say thus: We believe in one God, Father and Son and Holy Spirit'). The C text continues with the rest of Wulfstan's translation of the Creed, concluding with a passage that comprises a version of the ending found in B, that is, lines 42–8 of Napier 24. E, however, breaks off after the first words of the Creed with *ŕqŕ* [possibly for *et reliqua?*] *þis is awriten on ðære penitentiale* ('and the rest [?]'). This is written in the penitential'). The abrupt ending of the E text would seem to indicate that although a shift from Napier 25 into a full translation of the Creed appeared in the E exemplar, the scribe Wulfgeat, having already copied the translation into an unnamed penitential, chose not to copy it again. Ker has suggested that the penitential in question is G, a manuscript copied by Wulfgeat that includes two penitentials.³¹

If the B homily is indeed an early version of the text, it would appear that the versions found in C and E represent an expansion and reworking of that homily by someone who added the intermediary rubrics, discarded Napier 23, added Napier 25 and part of Napier 26 after line 28 of Napier 24, and then returned to the final lines of Napier 24 for his conclusion. It would seem unlikely for anyone other than Wulfstan himself to make such changes, and if so, the textual history of the letter allows us to see the hand of the homilist at work, revising, combining, and adapting already existing material to create something better than had gone before. The omission of Napier 23 improves the logical progression of the sermon, while the truncation of Napier 24 at line 28, directly after the penalties for neglecting the early baptism of a child, allows the text to flow naturally into the letter's presentation of Napier 25, a text that begins by discussing the importance to the faithful of understanding

³⁰ Transcription from C, p. 23. I have silently expanded abbreviations.

³¹ Ker, item 331, p. 393.

the meaning of the baptism they have already received and the necessity for those who are to be baptized as adults to learn the significance of the sacrament before undertaking it. The second part of Napier 25 is a quick reprise of the main points of the composite sermon so far (Napier 123/13–124/10):

Ac þæt bið cristenes mannes þearf, þæt he smeage aa ymbe cristendom georne and acsie georne, hwæt him sy to donne and hwæt to forganne, and smeage gelome, hu þeos woruld ærest gewurde, and swa forð, þæt he wite, hu Crist to mannun come, and eal, hwæt he on life adreah for ure pearfe, and hu he on rode ahangen wearð, and he to heofonum astah, and hu he of deaðe aras, and hu he þanan eft to ðam miclum dome cymð, þe we ealle to sculon. On þam dome witodlice he eowað us his blodian sidan and his þýrlan handa and ðæne þýrnenan helm and ða sylfan rode, þe he for ure neode on ahangen wæs, and wile þonne anrædlice witan æt us, hu we him þæt geleanodon, and hu we urne cristendom gehealdan habban. Wel þam þonne, þe hyne wel gehealdan hæfð, and wa ðam þonne, þe his ær nolde giman, swa swa he sceolde

But it is necessary for a Christian man that he always eagerly seek out knowledge about Christianity, and ask earnestly what he is to do and what to forgo, and seek earnestly to know how this world first came to be and so on, so that he learns how Christ came to humanity and everything he endured in his life for our need, and how he was hung on the cross and ascended to heaven, and how he arose from death and how he will come again to the great judgment of us all. At that judgment he will clearly show us his bloody side and his pierced hands and the crown of thorns and the same cross that he for our need was crucified on. And he will then make known clearly to us how we repaid him for that and how we have held to our Christianity. Well it will be for him who has held to it well, and woe to him then who would not take heed earlier as he should have.

Bethurum's assessment of Napier 25 as a 'short, poorly composed recapitulation on baptism'³² ignores its manuscript context, that is, its position as an integral part of the pastoral letter. Seen in context, the passage works fairly well as a recapitulation of what has gone before and as a transition to what for Wulfstan was probably the most important part of the pastoral letter: the translation of the Apostles' Creed.

Some support for this sequence of events is found in C, where Napier 23 appears directly after the letter, with the rubric *To Eallum Folce* rather than *To Folce*: if Napier 23 were dropped from the letter, but the archbishop or a later scribe did not wish to discard it entirely, it is plausible that somewhere along the line of transmission it would be copied in this position. The C scribe then appends three additional texts: Napier homilies 27, 34 (Bethurum XXI) and 28 (Bethurum XIX). Napier 27 and 34 again carry the rubric *To Eallum Folce*; Napier 28 begins at the end of 34 without a rubric or textual break and on the same line. This series is followed by three additional Wulfstan texts, each with its own rubric: *Be mislicum gelimpum* (Napier 35), *Her is git oþer wel god eaca* (Napier 38), and *Ðis man gerædde þa se micle here com to lande* (Napier 39). Thus, although C contains the most complete version of Wulfstan's pastoral letter, the initial impression it gives to the reader is that of a series of short homiletic passages.

³² Bethurum, p. 37.

K begins with the rubric *To Eallan Folke*. Subsequent rubrics divide the text into sections that are not precisely the same as those in C and E, and additional texts are incorporated into the sequence, creating ten parts rather than five. The structure is again most easily followed by identifying the sections with Napier's edition of the texts: part I corresponds to Napier 19; part II includes Napier 20, 21, 22, and lines 1–28 of Napier 24; part III, lines 29–41; part IV, lines 42–8; part V, Napier 36; part VI, Napier 23; part VII, Napier 27; part VIII, Napier 51; part IX, Napier 25; and part X, Napier 26 – Wulfstan's translation of the Apostles' Creed. This sequence is followed by two further Wulfstan homilies with the rubrics *To Mæsse Prostum* and *To Mæsse Preostum* respectively (Napier 52 and 53).

The additions to the homiletic sequence are extensive, but the changes are relatively few: first, Napier 24 is included in its entirety as it occurs in B, rather than the shortened text as found in C and E, but here it has been split into three separate sections; second, four additional texts have been incorporated between Napier 24 and 25; third, Napier 26, the translation of the Creed, is not integrated into the end of Napier 25, but is copied from its beginning as it appears in G, thus indicating that the K scribe had access to a version other than that in C; and fourth; the ending of Napier 26 has been extended, albeit differently from in C: *7 se þe his credan elles ne cunne. geleorne hine huru þus on englisc ealswa hit awriten is. 7 uton æfre habban fulne hiht 7 fulne geleafan on god ælmihtigne. 7 lufian hine ofer ealle opre þincg. þonne geleanaþ he hit us. swa us leofast biþ. on heofonan rice mid ecera blisse a butan ende. amen*³³ ('And he who cannot learn his Creed otherwise, indeed let him learn it thus in English as it is written. And let us always have complete hope and complete belief in almighty God and praise him above all other things. Then he will reward us for it as is most to our liking in the kingdom of heaven with eternal bliss always without end, amen'). The textual divisions at the beginning of the series demonstrate that the K scribe (or the scribe of a previous exemplar) understood that some of the texts were once part of a single homily. As in C and E, the first text, Napier 19, is a section by itself. The second section, however, comprises Napier 20–2 and lines 1–28 of Napier 24, despite the fact that in C and E each Napier text has its own rubric and comprises its own section. The following two texts comprise Napier 24 lines 28–41 and 42–8 respectively, each under its own rubric. The inclusion of these texts would indicate that the K scribe or the scribe of his exemplar recognized that line 28 was not the end of the full text and restored the rest, albeit in two sections, most likely because his immediate exemplar was missing lines 28–41, which he would have had to find in a separate exemplar, and contained lines 42–8 in a different place, that is, the position it occupies in C and E at the end of Napier 26.

The next three sections are all part of the series appended to the end of the pastoral letter in C: Napier 36, unique to K, but which is a variant of Napier 35; Napier 23; and Napier 27. The fourth text, Napier 51, is again unique to K. All four texts end formally, with either the word *amen* (23 and 27) or the closing

³³ Transcribed from K, fol. 93r; cp. Napier 127n.

formula *halig drihten gemiltse us eallan . amen* ('may the holy Lord have mercy on us all, amen', 36 and 51), and there seems no reason to believe that they were understood as part of a larger composite work. Only then does the manuscript return to the final texts found in C and E as part of the pastoral letter, Napier 25 and 26. But whereas in C and E the ending of Napier 25 has been adapted to create a smooth transition into the introduction to the Apostles' Creed in Napier 26, here it ends with its own closing formula – *his wyllan wyrcean swa we iornost magon þonne habban we heofonan rices a buton ende . Amen* ('do his will as we most eagerly may, then we will have the kingdom of heaven always without end. Amen') – and the two texts are presented separately, each with its own rubric. Moreover, the full text of Napier 26, beginning with Wulfstan's translation of the Pater Noster, has been restored, apparently (like the middle section of Napier 24) from a different exemplar. Once again the details of the scribal process are speculative, but the conclusion, I think, is not: in this manuscript the pastoral letter has lost its textual identity as a composite work and has become what Ker perceived the various texts to be in his description of K – a set of 'short homiletic pieces'.³⁴

The pastoral letter is addressed to the thegns of the nation, the homily to the people at large. This would suggest that Wulfstan intended the homily as edifying reading matter for his lay recipients (whether they were literate themselves or had the text read to them) and as an exemplary sermon to be preached to the people for his clerical audience. The latter function may furnish a clue towards resolving the puzzle of the intermediary rubrics: it is possible that they provide alternative beginnings (and endings) to the homily for the use of individual priests. This would explain why the rubrics are missing in the earliest form of the homily, as witnessed in B, but occur in the pastoral letter proper. But if the rubrics were intended to make life easier for the priests, their purpose was misunderstood by at least one scribe, resulting eventually in the fragmentation of the homily as found in K.

³⁴ Ker, item 186, p. 245.

Sacramental Sermons

OF THE SACRAMENTS of the Catholic Church, Wulfstan was primarily concerned with baptism and penance. Notable for its absence is any homily pertaining to the sacrament of the eucharist: although it is possible that he composed such a sermon and it has not survived, it is likely that, given Wulfstan's characteristic emphasis on the sins of the English, he was more concerned with the sacraments involving the remission of sin: baptism, which removed the stain of original sin and provided admittance into the community of the faithful, and penance, which conferred forgiveness for sins and reconciled the penitent with both the community and the Church. Wulfstan's penitential writings, whether concerned with individual, public, or communal penance, emphasize the benefits that accrue to all Christians – both as individuals and as a community – from penitential actions. His sermons on baptism suggest that he expected priests in his dioceses to conduct both infant and adult baptisms; in addition, he uses the homilies and by implication the occasion to instruct the larger community on the importance of both the ritual and its obligations for the recipients and sponsors alike.

The early Church did not separate the sacraments of baptism and confirmation: what became confirmation in the western church grew out of the post-baptismal anointing and conferral of the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit in the original Roman rite, actions that were regarded as 'sealing' or 'finishing' the sacrament of baptism and that could be performed only by a bishop. The two rites were, however, soon separated in practice: Jerome admits in *Contra Luciferanos* that it is 'the custom of churches that the bishop makes excursions (*excurrat*) to those who, far from larger cities, have been baptized by presbyters and deacons, to lay on a hand for the calling down (*ad invocationem*) of the Holy Spirit';¹ there is also evidence of separation in southern Gaul in the fifth century and in Germany and elsewhere in the eighth century.² It was clearly impossible for bishops to travel to remote areas of their dioceses to attend every baptism, even (or especially) if, following Roman practice, the sacrament was given only at the Easter vigil, although with the development of the doctrine of original sin and the concomitant emphasis

¹ *Contra Luciferanos* 9 (PL 23, 172–3); cited in Leonel L. Mitchell, *Baptismal Anointing* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1966; repr. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1978), pp. 94–5.

² Peter Cramer, *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, c.200–c.1150* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 179.

on infant baptism, this practice quickly changed to baptism *quamprimum* ('as soon as possible').³ Thus baptisms performed by a deacon or priest would have to be 'confirmed' by the bishop later in a separate rite.

However, as J. D. C. Fisher points out, the situation in Anglo-Saxon England was particularly complex.⁴ Although the two rites had already been separated on various parts of the continent, the Roman rite introduced into England at the end of the sixth century did not allow for separation, thus creating 'a situation in which the introductory rite could be celebrated in its entirety only when a bishop was present to perform the hand-laying and consignation of the forehead'.⁵ As on the continent, however, the practical difficulties of such a requirement became immediately evident, and it is unlikely that the bishop's presence at even the majority of baptisms in England was ever more than 'an ideal that could not be realized'.⁶ The prescription that infants be baptized within thirty days of birth occurs as early as the late seventh century in the laws of Ine, which imposed a fine of thirty shillings for non-compliance and confiscation of the parents' property if the infant died unbaptized; nevertheless, in the eighth century the Council of Chelsea produced an order that the traditional season for baptism – that is, the Easter vigil – be observed according to canon law.⁷ By the eleventh century, the *Canons of Edgar* shortened the time in which an infant was to be baptized to seven days;⁸ Ælfric states in his letter to Wulfsig that an infant should be baptized 'immediately with haste, so that it does not die a heathen' (*sona mid ofste, þæt hit ne swelte hæðen*⁹), and in his first Old English letter to Wulfstan he reiterates that the sacrament should take place 'as soon as the baptism may be most quickly arranged' (*swa ræpe swa man rapost mæge hi geradian to fulluhte*¹⁰). In both letters, Ælfric affirms that one difference between a priest and a bishop is the bishop's power to *biscopienne* infants (*cild*) and adults (*menn*);¹¹ the word *biscopienne* is generally taken to mean 'confirm'. Yet at the same time, there is evidence that in contemporary Irish practice priests rather than the bishop performed the elements of the confirmation rite within baptisms,¹² and although no corresponding evidence exists for Anglo-Saxon England, it is possible that knowledge of the Irish ritual raised questions with regard to the restriction of the post-baptismal anointing to the bishop alone. It is no wonder that Bethurum notes that there may still have been some confusion in late Anglo-Saxon England as to whether there should be one sacrament or two and whether only a bishop could administer confirmation.¹³ Although

³ Ibid., p. 138.

⁴ J. D. C. Fisher, *Christian Initiation: Baptism in the Medieval West*, Alcuin Club Collections 47 (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1965), pp. 78–87.

⁵ Ibid., p. 79.

⁶ Ibid., p. 81.

⁷ Ibid., p. 82.

⁸ Ine 2, Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, p. 88; *Canons of Edgar*, ch. 15.

⁹ Fehr, *Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, p. 16.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 130.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 11, 110.

¹² Fisher, pp. 82–5.

¹³ Bethurum, p. 304.

Wulfstan does not speak directly on either question, his answers are implicit in four of his homilies: a series of three interconnected sermons on baptism and one on the sevenfold gifts of the spirit received during confirmation.

Wulfstan's homilies on baptism form a progression similar to that found in some of his other sermons: the first sermon, *Incipit de baptismo* (Bethurum VIIIA), is a Latin outline made up for the most part of quotations, here largely taken from Carolingian sources, that assumes adult baptism with the bishop's confirmation as part of a single ritual; the second, *Dominica iiiia vel quando volueris* (Bethurum VIIIB), is an English translation and elaboration of parts of the Latin text that is concerned with infant baptism without confirmation; and the third, *Sermo de baptismo* (Bethurum VIIIC; Napier 5), is a longer, more fully realized sermon drawing on the two previous homilies and dealing with both adult and infant baptism. That the Latin sermon is concerned only with adult baptism and does not separate the rite from confirmation owes to the nature of Wulfstan's sources; however, the fact that the third sermon concerns itself in large part with adult baptism is noteworthy, because it indicates that there may have been significant numbers of new converts in Wulfstan's dioceses, most likely made up of Danish merchants and settlers.

The Latin text is extant in C, W, X, Bar, and Cop; Bethurum prints it under the title *Incipit de baptisma*, drawing on the rubric in C. However, as J. E. Cross has pointed out, the reading *baptisma* is a 'clear error' on the part of the C scribe, who should have written *baptismo*.¹⁴ In W, the rubric has been corrected, with the 'o' written over an erasure; Cop reads *Incipit de Baptism*; Bar has *De Baptismo*; and in X the text is unrubricated. W incorporates a brief discussion of the history and use of chrism that occurs as a separate item in Bar, Cop, and X. Bethurum, following Jost, identifies the incorporated text as based on Theodulf of Orléans's *De ordine baptismi*;¹⁵ although in his discussion of the passage in Bar, Hans Sauer references *Ordo Romanus* 50, chapter 25.¹⁶ Cross notes that both Theodulf and the *Ordo Romanus* have a common source in the first two paragraphs of Isidore of Seville's *De ecclesiasticis officiis* 2.26, and that the wording in W is closer to Isidore than to the other two texts.¹⁷ If Wulfstan wrote the passage, he most likely followed his customary practice of returning to the original texts cited by his immediate sources, using Isidore rather than Theodulf or the *Ordo*.

A corresponding complexity of sources holds true for the homily proper, where Wulfstan's sources stem in large part from the Carolingian discussion of baptism initiated by a letter sent by Charlemagne to his bishops in 812, in which the emperor asks how priests were instructed about the sacrament. Bethurum lists Alcuin's letters, Jesse of Amiens's *Epistola de baptismo*, Theodulf

¹⁴ J. E. Cross, 'Wulfstan's *Incipit de Baptismo* (Bethurum VIII A): A Revision of Sources', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 90 (1989), 237–42, at p. 237n.

¹⁵ See Jost, 'Einige Wulfstantexte', p. 270.

¹⁶ Hans Sauer, 'The Transmission and Structure of Archbishop Wulfstan's "Commonplace Book"', in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (New York: Garland, 2000), pp. 339–93, at p. 351.

¹⁷ Cross, 'Wulfstan's *Incipit de Baptismo*', pp. 239–40.

of Orléans' *De ordine baptismi*, and Amalarius of Metz's *De ecclesiasticis officiis*.¹⁸ However, Cross points out that Bethurum cites Jesse in several instances where Wulfstan has instead paraphrased Jesse's sources, particularly Alcuin's *De baptismi caeremoniis* and Amalarius's *De ecclesiasticis officiis*,¹⁹ and in one instance cites Jesse where Wulfstan has quoted Theodulf.²⁰ This confusion of sources combined with the 'absolutely typical' nature of the homily when compared to Carolingian models has prompted Jones to suggest that rather than being 'cobbled' from a variety of source-texts, 'Bethurum's VIIIa is simply a digest that [Wulfstan] received ready-made'.²¹ It is equally possible that Wulfstan himself wrote the text based on a familiarity with Carolingian models, at times quoting from memory rather than a specific text.

The homily provides the order of the baptismal rite along with an explanation of its significance, in particular the reasons behind the use of salt, spittle, and chrism; the three immersions; clothing the recipient in white; and finally anointing his or her head with chrism and bestowing the *chrismale*. As noted above, the text assumes adult baptism: we are told that the *paganus* ('pagan', i.e., the unbaptized person) must become a *catechumenus* (Bethurum 169/3, 'catechumen') and be instructed in the faith prior to receiving the sacrament. The three immersions are associated not only with the Trinity and purification from the sin of Adam, but also with the remission of the catechumen's own sins, committed through the three actions of *consensu*, *suasione*, *delectatione* (171/51–2, 'consent, compliance, [and] delight').²² The final anointing and laying-on of hands by the bishop that accompany the invocation of the sevenfold gifts are included in the baptismal rite: baptism and confirmation are presented as a single sacrament.

Wulfstan's two vernacular homilies on baptism, however, each take the frequency of infant baptism into account, albeit in different ways, and both omit the confirmation sequence, indicating that Wulfstan was adapting his sources to contemporary Anglo-Saxon conditions. The first of the two sermons, *Dominica iiiia vel quando volueris* (Bethurum VIIIB), is found only in D. The homily lacks Wulfstan's characteristic opening formula *Leofan men*, beginning instead with a statement on the necessity for the clergy to educate the laity about the faith in order to turn them away from sin, and for the laity to listen to what the clergy tell them *to heora agenre ðearfe* (Bethurum 172/9, 'for their own need'). The omission of the opening formula may indicate that it is an unfinished draft of the later *Sermo de baptisate* (Bethurum VIIIc; Napier 5). The baptism described in the homily is explicitly an infant baptism: the word 'catechumen' is not used; rather, the recipient is called a child (*cild*, Bethurum 172/16), and no mention is made of pre-baptismal instruction or personal sins. Nor does Wulfstan provide an English equivalent for *paganus*,

¹⁸ Bethurum, p. 302.

¹⁹ Cross, 'Wulfstan's *Incipit de Baptismo*', pp. 238, 242.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

²¹ Jones, 'Wulfstan's Liturgical Interests', p. 329.

²² See Cross, who postulates an Irish homily or scriptural commentary as a possibly source for the specific triad ('Wulfstan's *Incipit de Baptismo*', pp. 240–1).

probably because its English translation, *hæþen* ('heathen'), is a word Wulfstan uses consistently not only for those practicing faiths other than Christianity, but also for Christians who commit a variety of unsavory acts,²³ and would thus seem inappropriate for an infant. The largest section of the homily comprises an explanation of the rite and the significance of its elements, and Wulfstan stays close to his sources throughout this portion of the text. His fascination with the forces of evil, evident in the eschatological homilies, is apparent in that he pays particular attention to the exorcism of the devil from the child's heart in order that *þam halgan gaste bið þonne eardungstow on þam menn gerymed* (172/21–2, 'room will be made for a dwelling place for the Holy Spirit within the person'). The parallel exorcism performed by the priest over the font, expelling the devil from its waters and infusing the spirit therein, is also emphasized. The additions that Wulfstan makes at the end of the homily stress the community of all Christians: whether they are rich or poor, men or women, *ealle cristene menn syndon to Cristes limum getealde* (Bethurum 174/71–2, 'all Christian people are counted as limbs of Christ'). Thus no Christian should ever injure another, and if injury has been done, he or she must atone for it and receive pardon from the person injured. As presented in the homily, the sacrament of baptism is important not only for the recipient, who is purged of the sin of Adam and brought into the faith, but also for the community as a whole, who will now welcome the newly baptized Christian into their midst as an equal – a spiritual sibling, a literal and metaphorical neighbor, and one of the limbs of Christ.

In *Sermo de baptisate* Wulfstan expands and elaborates on the earlier text, doubling its length and extending its scope to include both infant and adult baptism. The sermon is extant in B, C, E, and H, with a few lines preserved in M. Only B and H have the full rubric; in E the rubric is abbreviated *SERMO DE BAPTISM* in red letters; after the first paragraph there is a second rubric, *ITEM*, in red, followed by a line in capitals: *LEOFAN MEN ON DÆRE CRISTNUNGE DE*, the L being written in green. The second rubric may be simply a scribal error: subsequent usages of *Leofan men* do not occasion additional capitals or rubrics, but the L is in each case written in colored ink, alternating green and red; the colored capitals, as Ker remarks, effectively divide the text into five sections.²⁴ In C the sermon immediately follows Wulfstan's *Incipit de baptismo* and may have been regarded by the scribe as a translation or a part of that homily, which would account for the lack of a rubric; in addition, the C text ends several sentences before the conclusion as found in B and E. H cuts off less than halfway through the text at the bottom of fol. 132^v, after which a leaf is missing from the manuscript; the final few lines of the homily appear on what is now numbered fol. 133^r.

As in the first vernacular homily, Wulfstan begins the *Sermo de baptisate* with an address to both clergy and laity; however, here the introductory statements are expanded to make clear that the laity in question include

²³ Meaney, "'And we forbeodað'", pp. 462, 472.

²⁴ Ker, item 331, p. 392.

not only infants but also those seeking adult baptism: Wulfstan states that it is necessary for each person to understand his own baptism, and thus the clergy must give those seeking the sacrament instruction in the faith if they are old enough and have the intelligence (*gyf he þære ylde 7 ðæs andgytes hæfð*, Bethurum 175/6) to understand what they are told. Primary in terms of baptism are the two *pactiones*, that is, the *abrenuntio* or renunciation of the devil, his companions, and his works, along with the *credo*, a confession of belief in God and the promise of obedience to his commandments. Given that the majority of adult candidates for baptism may have been Scandinavian, Wulfstan may have been thinking about the renunciation of pagan rites²⁵ when he spoke of renouncing the devil's works, or he may simply have had in mind superstitious practices that could be observed by the English as well: in the final section of the homily he specifies that the catechumen must *ne gyman ge galdra ne idelra hwata, ne wigelunga ne wiccecræfta; 7 ne weorðian ge wyllas ne ænige wudutreowu* (184/165–7, 'turn away from incantations and idle auguries, soothsaying and witchcraft; and not honor wells or any trees'). In addition, candidates for baptism must learn the Pater Noster and Creed before receiving the sacrament, the first so that they may pray, the second in order to profess their faith.

The second section of the homily begins Wulfstan's explanation of the baptismal ritual itself; here, as in the earlier homily, Wulfstan follows the Gelasian rite,²⁶ occasionally stopping to expand or elaborate on a point. The word *cild* is notable by its absence; likewise absent is any reference to a post-baptismal anointing by the bishop. The rite ends with the catechumen's first communion; presumably confirmation is expected to come later. Also notable is Wulfstan's digression on the efficacy of the sacrament when performed by a sinful priest, a question that was the subject of some debate in the eleventh century. Wulfstan's position, that the sacrament is indelible and cannot be made 'any the worse' (*na þe wyrse*, Bethurum 177/41) by a sinful priest nor better or more noble by a pious one, follows Augustine in *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, but may also have been influenced by Ælfric's second Old English letter to Wulfstan.²⁷

The brief third section of the homily once again emphasizes the secondary function of baptism as serving to create a familial community of Christians. Wulfstan begins with the assertion that all Christians are 'limbs' of Christ and continues with a brief explanation of what it means to be a Christian: to obey Christ's commandments and reject the devil's teachings, to keep the promises made at the time of baptism, to love God above all and to love one's neighbor as oneself. He reiterates that all are brothers in Christianity because through baptism all are made the children of Christ if they so desire (*gyf we sylfe willað*, Bethurum 181/112).

²⁵ See Bethurum, p. 314n.

²⁶ For a discussion of Wulfstan's homily in terms of the baptismal liturgy, see M. Bradford Bedingfield, *The Dramatic Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2002), pp. 171–84.

²⁷ See Bethurum, p. 315n.

Thus Christians should always treat each other as they would wish to be treated, and the one who does so is blessed.

In the fourth section, Wulfstan continues with an extended discussion of the *pactiones*, summed up in the two words *abrenuntio* ('I renounce') and *credo* ('I believe'). These words bring him to the subject of infant baptism, for an infant clearly cannot renounce or affirm belief in anything; rather, the child's sponsors (here called *freonda*, Bethurum 182/129, 'friends') must speak for him or her. Wulfstan is adamant that the promises made by the sponsors at an infant's baptism mean nothing in the child's later life if the child does not keep the promises him or herself. It is thus incumbent upon adults to teach their children at least the rudiments of Christianity, and in order to do that properly, the adult must *rihtne geleafan on ænne Godd æfre habbe, 7 þæt he his fulluhtes gescad wite 7 þæt symle rihtlice healde* (182/139–41, 'have correct belief in one God always, and he must know the meaning of his baptism and always hold it correctly'). Most important in a child's education are the prayers the adult catechumen is to know in advance, the Pater Noster and Creed, and these are to be taught to the child as soon as it can speak (*æfre swa þæt cild raðost ænig ðing specan mæge*, 182/142–3). Adults who do not know the prayers themselves are not to be ashamed, but rather learn immediately, in English if not in Latin, because those who do not know the prayers are not good Christians and cannot rightly be baptized, confirmed, receive the eucharist, or be worthy of a consecrated grave.

Wulfstan ends the sermon in part five with one of his characteristic series of exhortations; in context these are to be taken as listing the works of the devil that the newly baptized catechumens and children have renounced, even though Wulfstan is here reworking a similar series from his sermon on Christian behavior, *Her ongynð be cristendome* (Bethurum Xc; Napier 10), which was most likely written during the interval between the composition of the two vernacular homilies on baptism and is based largely on Pirmin. As Bethurum notes, Wulfstan's exhortations here cover the eight capital sins as well as the ten commandments, the primary subjects of *Her ongynð be cristendome*, along with the specific injunctions against pagan practices cited above. She comments further that 'what [Wulfstan] adds to his sources is the idea of the Golden Mean, as he contrasts . . . the extreme of loquacity and frivolity on the one hand with sloth and despondency on the other'.²⁸

In fact, the homily as a whole is built on contrast, complementarity, and balance. If it is necessary for the laity to understand the meaning of baptism, it is likewise necessary for the clergy to teach them. If the sins of the priest cannot corrupt the sacraments, his piety cannot improve them; by contrast, the sins of the recipient will render the sacraments personally ineffective. Adult baptism is both the same as and different from infant baptism. Christians should do unto others only as they would like others to do unto them. Renunciation of the devil contrasts with a new belief in and acceptance of God; through exorcism room is made in the catechumen's heart for the Holy

²⁸ Bethurum, p. 381n.

Spirit (*ðam halgum gaste byð sona eardungstow on þam menn gerymed*, Bethurum 177/34–5). Even Wulfstan's characteristic litotes in the injunctions marked by the word 'too' – one should not be 'too angry nor too quarrelsome nor too contentious nor too talkative nor at all too inclined to laugh nor again too sluggish or too sad' (*to weamode ne to niðfulle ne to flitgeorne ne to felawyrde ne ealles to hlagole ne eft to asolcene ne to unrote*, 184/168–70) – contributes to the sense of balancing both opposites and complements against each other to create a unified whole.

Be ðam seofanfealdan godes gyfan ('Concerning the sevenfold gifts of God'; Bethurum IX,²⁹ Napier 7) is the earliest of the four texts, and comprises Wulfstan's rewriting of Ælfric's *De septiformi spiritu*, a sermon originally printed by Napier as 'Wulfstan' Homily 8. Wulfstan's version is extant in full in E (the only manuscript to contain the rubric) and in part in C and B. In E the text is prefaced by a Latin passage rubricated *DE SEPTIFORME SPŪ* that also serves as preface to Ælfric's version of the sermon in all of its manuscripts.³⁰ The C text begins some 69 lines into the homily (in Bethurum's lineation) as a result of a missing page,³¹ while in B only the ending that Wulfstan added to Ælfric's homily appears, forming the conclusion of an anonymous, albeit 'Wulfstanized', sermon rubricated *In die iudicii* (Napier 40) that is at base a version of Vercelli Homily 2. Most of Wulfstan's homily follows Ælfric's text closely, although he makes some small changes and additions to the main body of the sermon, the majority of them stylistic,³² and appends a lengthy eschatological conclusion. Both sermons detail the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit as well as the seven evil gifts of the devil (the so-called *ungifta*, 'un-gifts') that stand in opposition to them, and may be seen as commentaries on the sacrament of confirmation.

The sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit are enumerated in Isaiah 11: 2–3, where they are listed as attributes given by the Spirit to a judge who will arise *de radice Iesse* ('from the root of Jesse', Isaiah 11: 1) and whom the church identified with Christ. While the gifts are fully realized only in Christ, through the sacrament of confirmation each recipient becomes a member of the Christian community and therefore a 'limb' of the body of Christ. The gifts themselves – wisdom, understanding, good counsel, strength of mind, knowledge, piety, and fear of God – are qualities necessary to create a harmonious society, to live a moral life in the world, and to prepare for its end; the corresponding evil gifts of the devil that Ælfric and Wulfstan enumerate in their homilies – lack of wisdom, foolishness, recklessness,

²⁹ Bethurum titles her text 'De Septiformi Spiritu'.

³⁰ Ælfric's *De septiformi spiritu* is extant in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116, Junius 23, Junius 24; London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C.vi; and Cambridge, Trinity College B.15.34. Note that Andy Orchard mistakenly asserts that none of the manuscripts containing the Wulfstan text also has the Latin preface. See Orchard, 'Crying Wolf', pp. 243–4.

³¹ See Ker, item 49, p. 85.

³² Bethurum, p. 306, gives a somewhat incomplete listing of Wulfstan's changes; more comprehensive is Orchard's discussion of how Wulfstan's changes to Ælfric's text reflect his idiosyncratic style and formulaic methods of composition, in 'Crying Wolf', pp. 243–7 and 259–64.

weak-mindedness, ignorance, impiety, and arrogance – are qualities that can not only lead an individual into sin, but on a larger scale may also lead to societal chaos. In addition, the sacrament recalls the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles at Pentecost in preparation for their going out into the world as preachers (Acts 2: 1–4), and therefore, although Wulfstan tells his audience that the gifts are given daily to good Christians according to their capacities (*ælcum be his mæðe*, Bethurum 186/29), he adds that they are also specifically granted to the apostles' spiritual descendants, that is, to *biscopas on bispunge to Gode sylfum wilniað georne* (Bethurum 186/30–1, 'bishops at their consecration to bind them earnestly to God himself'). By implication, it is the bishop alone who may confer those gifts on the individual Christian at confirmation.

As noted above, Wulfstan adds a fairly lengthy conclusion concerning Antichrist and his relationship to the seven evil gifts; its appearance in B as part of Napier 40 indicates that the ending may have circulated independently from the homily itself. Wulfstan prepares for his eschatological ending through small additions to Ælfric's description of the *ungifta* that reiterate and underscore the emphasis in the eschatological homilies on deception and hypocrisy: whereas Ælfric merely states that sinners often disguise the evil gifts by feigning to possess their opposites, Wulfstan adds in each case a variant of *and eac þæt gyt wyrse is* ('and also what is yet worse'), thereby implying that the hypocrisy is a greater sin than that occasioned by the *ungift* itself. Wulfstan's first additional paragraph at the end of the text makes that idea explicit in its initial sentence: *Nis næfre nan wyrse yfel ne Gode laðre þonne þæt gehwode yfel, forðan deofol sylf hit gefadað and gehywað to þam* (Bethurum 189/107–8, 'There is no worse evil or one more hateful to God than that hypocritical evil, because the devil himself guides and forms it'). Antichrist, here called *þeodlicetere* (189/116, 'the arch-hypocrite'³³), is, of course, the prime perpetrator of this sin, for *ne weorþeð on worulde ænig woruldsnotera ne on wordum getingra ne on heortan wyrse and lytelice swicolra þonne he wyrðeþ* (189/117–20, 'there will never be anyone in the world more worldly-wise nor more fluent in words nor worse in heart and more deceptively deceitful than he is'). Moreover, if Antichrist is the arch-hypocrite, those who habitually practice hypocrisy in their own lives are *rihtliceteras* (189/112, 'downright hypocrites'). Contemporary hypocrites are not called 'antichrists' here as they are in *De Anticristo*; rather they are designated Antichrist's precursors (*forboda*) and slaves (*þrælas*), who clear his way (*þe his weg rymað*, 190/127–8) and whose actions are pleasing to him (*mid ðam unwrencan eallan bið huru se earmscapena man Antecrist eal afyllled* (189/113–14, 'with all those stratagems the miserable man Antichrist is indeed entirely satisfied'). One way in which Antichrist's servants clear a way for him is by deceiving others into sin, specifically by teaching them to indulge in their carnal desires: *Cweþað . . . to worde þa ðe syndan*

³³ Bethurum notes that the word appears here for the first time in Wulfstan's writing, although, she continues (p. 322), 'If it had been in Wulfstan's vocabulary when he wrote the eschatological homilies, he probably would have used it'.

stunte þæt mycel forhæfednes lytel behealde, ac þæt mete wære mannum gescapen to ðam anum þæt men his scoldan brucan, and wimman eac to hæmede þam ðe þæs lyste (Bethurum 190/140–3, ‘They say . . . in words that those who hold to great abstinence are foolish, but that food was created for men only so that they could enjoy it, and women to have sex with as they desire’). Taken together with the eschatological homilies, this sermon makes clear that the themes of hypocrisy, deception, sexual misconduct, and Antichrist are collocated in Wulfstan’s mind, and their treatment would almost inevitably assure an eschatological ending to a homily that also dealt with those themes.

Peter Cramer describes the Carolingian understanding of confirmation as ‘a moment, like the moment of Pentecost which it still resembles, of going out from innocence into the world’.³⁴ Wulfstan may well have had a similar understanding, and in his homily he gives the recipients of the sacrament a choice as to *how* they will go out into the world, as one of the limbs of Christ, sheltered and nourished by a Christian community and the gifts of the Spirit, or as a slave of Antichrist, enticing others into sin and preparing the way for the end of the world. Such a choice indicates how Wulfstan saw the sacraments in general: the recipient was not meant to passively accept the spiritual benefits of the sacrament; rather, he or she must use those benefits correctly, making the proper choices entailed by confirmation, living up to the promises made at the time of baptism, and using the gift of absolution to renounce all sin in the future.

If baptism removed the stain of original sin, sins committed after baptism needed to be erased through the sacrament of penance. Late Anglo-Saxon England recognized three distinct forms of penitential practice: private or ‘secret’ penance (*paenitentia occulta*),³⁵ assigned to individuals by their confessors; public penance (*paenitentia publica*), imposed by bishops upon those openly committing serious sins; and communal penance, carried out by all members of society at times of national or regional disaster. Both communal penance and public penance are generally associated with Wulfstan’s writings: communal penance because of his authorship of the so-called ‘penitential edict’ of 1009 (VII Æthelred; Napier 39), which legislated a nationwide three-day fast in the face of the Viking invasions, and the homily *Be mistlican gelimpan* (Napier 35), which recommended such a fast in the event of any great danger to the community; and public penance owing to two related homilies, *Sermo in .XL.* (Bethurum XIV; Napier 17), written to be preached at the Ash Wednesday service expelling public penitents from the church, and *Sermo de cena domini* (Bethurum XV; Napier 32), written for the Maundy Thursday reconciliation service. By way of contrast, Wulfstan’s writings

³⁴ Cramer, *Baptism*, p. 182.

³⁵ As Mayke de Jong points out, the term ‘private penance’, used by most modern scholars, did not come into use until the twelfth century, ‘and moreover evokes a whole range of modern connotations of “privacy” best left aside. Carolingian legislators employed . . . *paenitentia occulta* or *paenitere obsconse*’. See de Jong, ‘What was Public about Public Penance? *Paenitentia Publica* and Justice in the Carolingian World’, *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull’alto medioevo* 44 (1997), 863–902, at pp. 864–5.

on private penance – fragmented and scattered among other works in the manuscripts – have received relatively little attention.

The most important of these writings have not been recognized as Wulfstan's own:³⁶ they comprise two sections of a vernacular *Handbook* for confessors that was probably compiled and revised by the archbishop and has been given a modern edition by Roger Fowler.³⁷ The *Handbook* survives in whole or in part in six eleventh-century manuscripts, with isolated passages and reminiscences in four others: the six are C, G, K, and X; Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 8558–63 (2498), a manuscript whose penitential contents associate it with Wulfstan's 'commonplace book';³⁸ and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 482 (1054), a Worcester manuscript that includes copies of the Pseudo-Ecgbert Penitential and Confessional among other penitential materials.³⁹ Only C contains all six texts associated by its editor with the *Handbook*: part I is a Latin *Ordo confessionalis*; part II, a vernacular confessional formula; part III, a set of instructions for confessors that makes use of the Pseudo-Ecgbert Penitential; part IV, a shortened form of that penitential; part V, further instructions to confessors; and part VI, methods by which wealthy penitents may have their penances commuted.⁴⁰ A shorter version of the *Handbook* comprising sections I, III, IV, and V is extant in the Brussels manuscript and X. The three remaining manuscripts each contain partial versions or individual, sometimes repeated, sections: K gives parts I, II, III, a second version of III, IV, and V; G has parts V, III, and V again; while Laud Misc. 482 contains three copies of part V, two of III, and one of VI.

The instructions for confessors (sections III and V) show clear evidence of Wulfstan's style and should be regarded as his compositions.⁴¹ Section III concerns the initial meeting between confessor and penitent and the evaluation of the penitent's sins; the instructions are apparently designed for the priest to keep in mind when consulting the penitential. They include directions concerning the treatment of penitents who are eager to confess their sins as

³⁶ Catherine Cubitt has noted that she will be publishing the case for Wulfstan's authorship of part or all of the *Handbook* in a forthcoming volume entitled *Penance and Penitentials in Late Saxon England*. I have not seen her argument.

³⁷ Roger Fowler, 'A Late Old English Handbook for the Use of a Confessor', *Anglia* 83 (1965), 1–34. My discussion is heavily dependent throughout on Fowler's introduction to the edition.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 2. For the 'commonplace book' manuscripts, see Hans Sauer, 'Zur Überlieferung und Anlage von Erzbischof Wulfstans "Handbuch"', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 36 (1980), 341–84; translated into English as Sauer, 'The Transmission and Structure'.

³⁹ For a full discussion of each of these manuscripts' connections with Wulfstan, see Melanie Heyworth, 'The "Late Old English Handbook for the Use of a Confessor": Authorship and Connections', *Notes and Queries* (2007), 218–22; as well as Fowler, 'A Late Old English Handbook', pp. 1–3. The four additional manuscripts are Cambridge, Cambridge University Library Ii.I. 33 and Add. 3206; and London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A.iii and Otho B.x.

⁴⁰ The order in C seems correct, with the exception that the scribe has copied section III twice, once on either side of section II.

⁴¹ See, for example, the two-stress phrases that make up lines 91–6, the repetition of *for Gode and for worlde* at lines 101 and 111–12 of section III, and the usage of a section of Jost's Appendix B at lines 317–40 of section V (discussed further below). Fowler notes that Section III is strongly connected to Wulfstan's legal codes and lists seventeen 'points of contact' with Wulfstan's homilies, but nonetheless considers Wulfstan's authorship of these sections questionable ('A Late Old English Handbook', pp. 10–11n).

well as those who are reluctant or unsure of what to confess; in addition, the text insists on the necessity of differentiating between penitents when evaluating their sins, taking into consideration their social status, general circumstances, and personal characteristics. To illustrate this injunction, Wulfstan lists the possible types of sinners in his characteristic two-stress rhythm, making use of paranomasia (*þam eadmodan and þam ofermodan*) and partial rhyme (*þam strangan and þam unmagan*).⁴² He points out that those who are more powerful or in higher clerical orders must *deoppor for Gode and for worlde unriht gebetan* ('atone for sin the deeper for God and for the world'); the section ends with a repetition of the phrase *for Gode and for worlde*. Moreover, as Fowler has noted, there are significant parallels between section III of the *Handbook* and VI Æthelred, indicating not only Wulfstan's involvement with the *Handbook*, but also 'suggesting that the *Handbook* came first'.⁴³

Section V is designed to help the priest determine what penance to impose after hearing the penitent's confession, evaluating the sins, and consulting the penitential. Here Wulfstan reminds the priest that the purpose of penance is to heal rather than punish through extended use of a conventional medical analogy: just as a sick person must vomit out the poison in his system (*aspiw[an] þæt attor þæt him oninnan bið*⁴⁴) before the physician can heal his body, a sinner must *aspiwan*, that is, confess, the poison of his sins before the priest can heal his soul. The text goes on to illustrate the precepts given in Part III by giving examples of penances appropriate to the rich and powerful, to those who are neither rich nor poor, and to the poor, as well as alternatives to fasting for the sick. Wulfstan's characteristic vocabulary is evident throughout the section in his repeated use of intensifiers (*georne, geornost, swiðe, swiðost, swiðe georne, to swiðe*), of *deofle* without an article, and of phrases like *oft and gelome*. He uses alliterating pairs such as *mete and munde, fir and foddor, bed and bæð*, and *cile and ceald*;⁴⁵ he enjoins the penitent to *do swa him þearf is*⁴⁶ ('do as is necessary for himself') to lead himself and others away from sin. Moreover, a full paragraph of the text recurs in one of two related homiletic fragments addressed to priests that Wilcox attributes to Wulfstan, both of which have been interpolated into the G text of the *Institutes of Polity* as individual chapters, printed by Jost as his Appendices B and C. Each text carries the rubric *Ad sacerdotes* and both are also extant in fragmented form in Cambridge, University Library, Add. 3206, a short, heavily damaged manuscript that also includes parts of a chapter of *Polity* and Jost's Appendix D.

Appendix B is made up almost entirely of the portion of part V of the *Handbook* that details the medical analogy. Here, however, it is placed in a homiletic context and adapted for direct address:

La leof, understandað eow sylfe 7 lufiað 7 weorðiað God ælmihtigne ofer ealle
oðre þinc 7 healdað his beboda georne. 7 lufige eower ælc operne rihtlice, 7 beo

⁴² Fowler, 'A Late Old English Handbook', p. 19.

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 10–11n.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 27/324.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 30.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 31.

ælc oðrum eage 7 eare 7 ælc oðrum on helpe for Gode 7 for worulde. Libbað heononforð regollican life. Secað eowre cyrican 7 gefyllað eowre tida áá on gesetne timan. Lærað cristen folc georne 7 lacniað hit georne 7 geþencað, þæt se læce, þe sceall yfele w[ul]nda hælan, he mot habban gode sealfe to.⁴⁷

Oh, beloved, understand yourself and love and honor God almighty over all other things and hold his commandments earnestly. And love each other rightly, and be for each other eyes and ears and help each other for God and the world. Live henceforth by the rule. Go to your church and keep the canonical hours always at the set time. Teach Christian people eagerly and heal them earnestly and be mindful that the physician who must heal evil wounds must have good salve.

Although Appendix C begins with one of Wulfstan's favorite topics, the importance of teaching the faithful the significance of baptism, it immediately returns to the subject of penitence, again using the metaphor of healing: *Synfulles mannes læcedom is, þæt he andette 7 bete georne*⁴⁸ ('A sinful person's healing is that he confess and atone earnestly').

Section VI, on the commutation of penances for the wealthy, is more problematic in that it shows some small evidence of Wulfstan's style, although the case is far from clear. Wulfstan seldom left individual words such as *absolutionem*⁴⁹ untranslated and undefined; moreover, the laxity of the text's provision for the commutation of penances, which, as Fowler notes, 'contradicts the principle on which commutation is based', along with the 'peculiarly inept' Latin tag that concludes the text,⁵⁰ is inconsistent with Wulfstan's characteristic rigor and speaks against his authorship. It is perhaps safest to associate Wulfstan only with the short version of the *Handbook*.

It seems plausible to assume with Fowler that the shorter version of the *Handbook* found in X and the Brussels manuscript is the earliest,⁵¹ with sections II and VI added later. The evidence of K, which contains all of the texts of the short version along with section II but not section VI, would appear to indicate that the confessional formula was the first to be incorporated, and the section on the commutation of penances for the wealthy – extant only in C and among the disconnected *Handbook* texts in Laud Misc. 482 – added last. It is likely that Wulfstan initially combined the Latin *Ordo* and the shortened penitential with his own archiepiscopal directions for the evaluation of sins and the assignment of penances to produce the first version of the *Handbook* for the use of priests in his dioceses. It is tempting to speculate that Wulfstan created the shortened version of the Pseudo-Ecgbert Penitential as well: no fewer than five of the 'commonplace book' manuscripts contain the penitential,⁵² and sections III and V of the *Handbook* make use of it. The *Handbook's* elimination of the penitential's penalties for bishops strengthens the probability that it was

⁴⁷ Jost, *Polity*, p. 170.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 174.

⁴⁹ Fowler, 'A Late Old English Handbook', p. 33.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 14.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 4.

⁵² Sauer, 'The Transmission and Structure', p. 359. The manuscripts are X; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 37; Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1382 (U. 109), fols. 173r–198v; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 718; and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 3182.

designed for sacerdotal rather than (archi)episcopal confessors; however, the revisions to the Penitential are stylistically inconclusive, and the question of Wulfstan's involvement must remain open.⁵³ It is likewise impossible to say whether Wulfstan was responsible for the later addition of the confessional formula, but on the whole this seems unlikely: the text shows no signs of his revision, and may be a shortened version of a similar confessional formula found in London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D.xx,⁵⁴ a manuscript not otherwise associated with Wulfstan.⁵⁵

As the medical metaphor demonstrates, the primary purpose of penance was the healing or purification of the soul through confession and absolution rather than punishment for sin. An important secondary purpose, as Allen Frantzen points out, was the education of the faithful:

In confession the priest tested the penitent's knowledge of the fundamental teachings of the church and ensured his belief in them. The penitent was then told that his faith was a mandate: if he believed in the existence of God and the devil, of heaven and hell, and if he believed that his actions would ultimately lead him to one of these two eternal homes, he would strive to shape his own life on the Christian model.⁵⁶

The catechetical education provided for individuals in private penance was extended to society at large not only through homilies but also through the practices of public and communal penance. It is little wonder that Wulfstan, as guardian of the spiritual health of the community within his dioceses and responsible for preparing the faithful to defend themselves against the imminent threat of the Vikings and the ultimate threat of Antichrist, should have actively promoted these far-reaching penitential models.

The theoretical relationship between public and private penance – the so-called 'Carolingian dichotomy' – is summed up by Ælfric in his sermon for *Dominica xvii post pentecosten*: *Pa diglan gyltas man sceal digelice betan, and ða openan openlice*⁵⁷ ('Secret sins should be atoned for secretly, and open openly'). The formula called for priests hearing the confessions of individual penitents to assign penance for minor (i.e., 'secret') sins according to the guidelines set out in the penitentials; penitents confessing extremely serious, openly committed sins were to be referred to the bishop, who could then impose a more extensive, and possibly public, penance. However, as Mayke de Jong points out, 'the apparently neat division . . . was not so much a description of actual practice as an attempt to classify a disorderly reality'.⁵⁸ In practice,

⁵³ Fowler, 'A Late Old English Handbook', pp. 8–9.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁵⁵ Allen J. Frantzen also notes that 'there is strong evidence that this was an interpolation and not part of the compiler's original design'; see *The Literature of Penance in Anglo-Saxon England* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1983), pp. 139–40. Frantzen does not identify the 'compiler' with Wulfstan.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

⁵⁷ Peter Clemoes, ed., *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series. Text*, EETS ss. 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 462.

⁵⁸ de Jong, 'What was Public about Public Penance?', p. 866. Similarly, Rob Meens points out that 'One should not forget, however, that this was a theoretical solution to a probably extremely confusing situation'. See his 'The Frequency and Nature of Early Medieval Penance', in

'secret' or 'private' penance tended to be both public and communal, in part because the fasting and almsgiving most often required as penance for private sins could hardly have been kept secret in small medieval communities,⁵⁹ and in part because confession was strongly linked to communion and thus to specific periods of the liturgical year, primarily Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas, so it was likely that the adult members of a community would be performing their penances at roughly the same time.⁶⁰ Nor could all those committing major sins be subjected to public penance, which required the presence of the bishop. Rather, public penance – at least among the Carolingians – tended to be reserved for sins that were also 'notorious crime[s] . . . [that had] compromised someone's reputation'⁶¹ and could therefore only be remitted through a public display of repentance designed in part to appease a scandalized community.

Public penance was bracketed by two liturgical rituals performed by the bishop at the beginning and end of Lent: the first a rite of dismissal, expelling penitents from the church on Ash Wednesday, and the second a rite of absolution and reconciliation on Maundy Thursday. During the intervening period, as Wulfstan states in *Sermo de cena domini*, the penitent was expected go to the church *dæges 7 nihtes* (Bethurum 237/52–3, 'day and night') to kneel outside the doors, calling out to Christ and praying for forgiveness until he was once again permitted to enter.

Scholarly consensus has long been that private penance was the norm in England throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, owing in part to the early influence of Irish penitentials.⁶² There is, however, disagreement as to whether or how far public penance was practiced as well. Evidence from contemporary sources is contradictory: Theodore's Penitential, dating from the early part of the eighth century, implies that public penance was unknown in England,⁶³ yet the roughly contemporaneous *Dialogus Ecgberti*, written in the mid to late eighth century and extant in some of the 'commonplace book' manuscripts, not only mandates public penance for major sins, but also forbids the ordination of anyone who has been required to perform it.⁶⁴ Liturgical forms for the Ash Wednesday and Maundy Thursday rituals were copied into English manuscripts in the tenth century, yet the author of the eleventh-century Pseudo-Ecgbert Penitential echoes Theodore in expecting the practice to be unfamiliar to his audience, calling it a custom known to those *begeondan sæ* ('beyond the sea') that should nevertheless be practiced by *eallum cristenum folce*

Handling Sin: Confession in the Middle Ages, ed. Peter Miller and A. J. Minnis. York Studies in Medieval Theology 2 (York: York Medieval Press, 1998), pp. 35–63, at pp. 47–8.

⁵⁹ de Jong, 'What was Public about Public Penance?', p. 866.

⁶⁰ Meens, 'The Frequency and Nature of Early Medieval Penance', pp. 38, 50.

⁶¹ de Jong, 'What was Public about Public Penance?', p. 867.

⁶² See, for example, Frantzen, *Literature of Penance*, p. 92.

⁶³ I.e., in *hac provincia* ('this province'). Theodore's Penitential I, 13.4, in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, III, p. 187.

⁶⁴ Bradford Bedingfield, 'Public Penance in Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglo-Saxon England* 31 (2002), 223–55, at p. 229.

(‘all Christian people’).⁶⁵ Wulfstan’s comment in *Sermo in .XL.*, that although public penance is the custom *on manegan stowan* (Bethurum 235/54, ‘in many places’), the English do not practice it ‘as well as we should’ (*swa wel swa we scoldan*, 235/61), is reminiscent of Pseudo-Ecgbert, yet whereas Pseudo-Ecgbert clearly assumes that public penance is unknown to his audience, Wulfstan’s words are ambiguous: is he speaking only of ‘many places’ found ‘beyond the sea’, or also of parts of England? Should the phrase ‘as well as we should’ be read literally or as a characteristically Wulfstanian litotes for ‘not at all’?⁶⁶ Answers to these questions can only be speculative, and must be inferred from evidence found in the manuscripts containing liturgical forms for the Ash Wednesday and Maundy Thursday services as well as from non-liturgical references to and descriptions of public penance such as are found in the *Handbook* and Wulfstan’s homilies.

Ordines for the ritual of reconciliation on Maundy Thursday are extant in thirteen out of twenty-one bishops’ books from Anglo-Saxon England.⁶⁷ Five of these – the Sherborne, Anderson, and Lanalet Pontificals, the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert, and the Canterbury Benedictional – contain what Sarah Hamilton has identified as a uniquely English *ordo* with no direct counterpart in continental liturgies, although it contains elements drawn from the Gelasian and Gregorian traditions. A sixth, the Ecgbert Pontifical, contains an *ordo* that is ‘closely related’, but not identical to the other five.⁶⁸ As described by Hamilton, the English *ordo* differs from the continental *ordines* in its omission of the procession of penitents into the church, in the addition of a prayer apparently unique to England beginning *Absoluimus te* [or *vos*] *vice beati petri apostolorum principis cui dominus potestatem ligandi atque soluendi dedit* (‘We absolve you in place of the blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, to whom the Lord gave the power to bind and to loose’), and in the bishop’s use of the indicative rather than the subjunctive in the formal absolution.⁶⁹ The Ecgbert Pontifical also includes an Old English translation of the *Absoluimus te*, indicating, as Bradford Bedingfield notes, ‘some sort of active Anglo-Saxon

⁶⁵ Josef Raith, ed., *Die altenglische version des Halitgar’schen Bussbuches* (Hamburg: H. Grand, 1933), pp. 9–11.

⁶⁶ Bedingfield, ‘Public Penance’, p. 252. Bedingfield also points out (p. 224) that these statements raise questions rather than answering them: is Wulfstan speaking of ‘many places’ in England or merely those ‘beyond the sea’? If the English do not observe public penance as well as they should, is Wulfstan ‘suggesting that the practice is known but not often exercised, or is he attempting to introduce something new’?

⁶⁷ Claudius Pontifical I; the Leofric Missal ‘A’ (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579); the Samson Pontifical, both in the portion copied at Winchester and also in the later Worcester additions (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 146); the Lanalet Pontifical (Rouen, BM, A. 27 (368)); the Canterbury Benedictional (London, British Library, Harley 2892); part II of the Ramsey Pontifical (London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A.vii, fols 1–112); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 163; the Sherborne Pontifical (Paris, BN, lat. 943); the Egbert Pontifical (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 10575); the Anderson Pontifical (London, British Library, Add. 57377); Part I of the Ramsey Pontifical; the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert (Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, Y. 7 (369)); and London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius E.xii.

⁶⁸ Sarah Hamilton, ‘Rites for Public Penance in Late Anglo-Saxon England’, in *The Liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield (London: Henry Bradshaw Society, 2005), pp. 65–103, at p. 80.

⁶⁹ Hamilton, ‘Rites for Public Penance’, pp. 80–1.

interest in the liturgical forms'.⁷⁰ Moreover, if Jones is correct that the Egbert Pontifical was one of Wulfstan's pontificals, this may have been the *ordo* used when the archbishop preached his *Sermo de cena domini*.

Only seven of the thirteen manuscripts containing the Maundy Thursday ritual also include an *ordo* for the dismissal of penitents on Ash Wednesday.⁷¹ Hamilton suggests that the discrepancy could stem from the practice of 'a form of mixed penance [in which] any priest could oversee the entry into penance, but only the bishop could reconcile penitents';⁷² if such 'mixed penance' were indeed practiced, not only were the boundaries between private and public penance more fluid than modern scholars have previously recognized, but English bishops were also active in tailoring the Carolingian rituals to their own purposes. Bedingfield likewise concludes that the extant Ash Wednesday *ordines* indicate a 'liturgically dynamic environment', in which there was 'more widespread interest in public penance than has been allowed'.⁷³ Clearly, if one were to look only at the liturgical evidence, it would be difficult to avoid the conclusion that public penance, perhaps of a 'mixed' kind, was practiced fairly regularly in late Anglo-Saxon England.

The non-liturgical evidence, however, paints a very different picture. Outside manuscripts and texts specifically associated with Wulfstan, there are strikingly few references to public penance. Ælfric's apparent summation of the 'Carolingian dichotomy', cited above, is not accompanied by an account of the public ritual, nor do his three descriptions of the Ash Wednesday service mention the dismissal of penitents by the bishop; in addition, Maundy Thursday is the first of the *swigdagas* ('silent days') on which Ælfric forbids the preaching of homilies.⁷⁴ The penitentials, with the exception of Pseudo-Egbert and its Carolingian source Halitgar, are silent on the subject, prescribing penances for capital sins on the private model. Moreover, both Pseudo-Egbert and Halitgar follow their descriptions of public penance with recommendations for private penances in the case of serious, often public sins such as homicide and perjury. Halitgar most likely intended to provide alternatives for confessors:⁷⁵ if the situation warranted (that is, if the sin had created a public scandal)⁷⁶ the priest could refer the penitent to the bishop, but if he felt public penance was not necessary, he could spare the penitent

⁷⁰ Bedingfield, 'Public Penance', p. 244.

⁷¹ Claudius Pontifical I, Leofric Missal 'A', the Samson Pontifical, the Lanalet Pontifical, the Canterbury Benedictinal, Part II of the Ramsey Pontifical, and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 163.

⁷² Hamilton, 'Rites for Public Penance', p. 74.

⁷³ Bedingfield, 'Public Penance', p. 248.

⁷⁴ Ælfric describes the Ash Wednesday ritual in his *Letter to the Monks of Eynsham* (ed. Christopher A. Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 120), in his Second Old English Letter to Wulfstan (Fehr, *Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, pp. 214–17), and in the homily for Ash Wednesday edited by W. Skeat in *Ælfric's Lives of the Saints*, EETS os 76, 82 (London, 1881, 1900), I, p. 264. For the 'silent days', see Joyce Hill, 'Ælfric's "Silent Days"', *Leeds Studies in English* 16 (1985), 118–31.

⁷⁵ See Bedingfield, 'Public Penance', pp. 231–2.

⁷⁶ Halitgar specifically states that public penance is required if someone has *commoverit* ('troubled') the church by a particular sin. See Bedingfield, 'Public Penance', p. 231.

the humiliation of the public ritual and impose a private penance. In Pseudo-Ecgbert, however, the recommendations for private penances for capital sins serve to emphasize the foreignness of the public ritual. Finally, although the Old English version of the Rule of Chrodegang prescribes public penance for canons guilty of serious sins such as murder, the Rule says nothing about the practice of public penance outside regular communities.

Of greater interest are the stipulations concerning penance listed by Hamilton that are found in the laws of Alfred, Athelstan, and II Edmund.⁷⁷ While none of these codes prescribe public penance *per se*, each makes clear that the bishop rather than a priest or confessor must assign and/or testify to the completion of penance for serious, public sins that are also crimes. First, Alfred's laws state that the penalty for failure to fulfil a pledge requires that the offending party surrender all his possessions and weapons to the keeping of his friends, be imprisoned for forty days, and suffer a penance imposed by the bishop (*ðrowige ðær swa biscep him scrife*).⁷⁸ Although the code does not specify the Lenten penitential ritual of dismissal and reconciliation, Hamilton notes that it 'echoes the penalties commonly associated with public penance', since 'under Carolingian and tenth-century continental church law the penitent was expected to give up his weapons and public office, and also abstain from marriage if unmarried, or refrain from marital relations if married'.⁷⁹ Second, Hamilton points out that a form of 'mixed penance' seems to underlie II Æthelstan 26, which requires a person guilty of swearing false oaths to be barred from taking further oaths and denied Christian burial, *buton he hæbbe ðæs biscoþes gewitnesse, ðe he on his scriftscire sy, þæt he hit swa gebet hæbbe, swa him his scrift scrife 7 his scrift hit gecyþe þam biscope binnon XXX nihta, hweþer he to þære bote cirran wolde* ('unless he has the testimony of the bishop of his diocese that he has done penance for it as his confessor prescribed, and his confessor makes it known to the bishop within thirty nights, whether he has submitted to the penance').⁸⁰ Third, II Edmund, a code written specifically to address the problem of blood feud, stipulates that those participating in such feuds must carry out an ecclesiastical penance (*godcunde bote underfangen*), pay compensation to the relatives, and fulfil all obligations laid on them by the bishop of the diocese (*swa biscop him tæce, ðe hit on his scyre sy*) before having access to the royal court.⁸¹ Interestingly, Wulfstan's laws are no more specific than those of his predecessors on the subject of public penance. V Æthelred 22 directs all Christians to confess their sins frequently, and 29 requires penance of all excommunicates; the latter may have required public atonement. II Cnut states that *godcunde bote sece mann symle georne be boctæcinge, 7 woruldcunde bote sece man be woruldlage* ('one should very earnestly seek divine amends according to the teaching of

⁷⁷ Hamilton, 'Rites for Public Penance', pp. 83–7.

⁷⁸ Alfred 1.2. Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, pp. 48–9. Patrick Wormald has argued that this legislation merely codified existing practice; see his *Making of English Law*, pp. 283–4.

⁷⁹ Hamilton, 'Rites for Public Penance', p. 84.

⁸⁰ See *ibid.*, p. 85; Athelstan II, c. 26: Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, pp. 164–5.

⁸¹ See Hamilton, 'Rites for Public Penance', p. 85; II Edmund 4; Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, pp. 188–9.

the book [i.e., the penitential], and worldly amends according to the secular law').⁸² Clearly, if Wulfstan intended to popularize the practice of public penance, he chose to do so through ecclesiastical rather than legislative means.

Wulfstan's interest in public penance is evidenced not only by his homilies but also by the 'commonplace book' manuscripts, which contain a variety of Latin texts concerning the penitential ritual, many of them still-unsourced excerpts comprising descriptions of the process as well as *ordines* and homilies for the Ash Wednesday and Maundy Thursday services.⁸³ Included among them in W and I is a shortened version of a sermon for Maundy Thursday by Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Près, Wulfstan's source for his *Sermo de cena domini*; the full text survives in Cop and in London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A.vii.⁸⁴ Two Old English sermons concerning the public ritual are also extant in W: the first is a closely literal, somewhat unskilled rendering of Abbo's sermon believed by Bethurum to have been assigned by Wulfstan as 'an educational exercise' to one of his household;⁸⁵ the second, Cameron B3.2.9, is an anonymous translation of an unedited Ash Wednesday homily also extant in I and Cotton Vitellius A.vii.⁸⁶ The two English texts are placed together in the proper order within the manuscript, and in writing his own homilies for the two services, it is possible that Wulfstan made use of the translations as well as their Latin originals.

Wulfstan's Ash Wednesday homily is rubricated *Sermo in .XL.* in E, its sole manuscript. Bethurum correctly observes that the homily as it stands is not 'completely developed';⁸⁷ the text not only lacks a homiletic conclusion, but breaks off twice with the abbreviation &rl (*et reliqua*, 'and the rest'), once in Wulfstan's discussion of the importance of tithing (Bethurum 233/14–15), and once immediately after his reiteration of the medical metaphor familiar from his writings on private penance: *Hir is nu swyðe gedafenlic tima þæt we us sylfe georne clænsian 7 ðurh soðe andetnesse ure synna us fram aspywan, forðam þurh þæt we magan mycle þe yð raðe gehælede weorðan &rl* (234/31–5, 'Here is now a very fitting time that we purify ourselves earnestly and through true confession vomit out our sins, because through that we may become the more quickly healed, etc.'). Both are subjects upon which the archbishop could be expected to extemporize; it is also possible, as Bethurum notes, that the text was shortened by the scribe Wulfgeat, who would know 'that St Wulfstan could add what he needed'.⁸⁸

⁸² For V Æthelred, see Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I, pp. 242–3, 244–5; for II Cnut, pp. 338–9.

⁸³ Bedingfield, 'Public Penance', pp. 235–7, details the arrangement of the penitential excerpts in W. Some of the texts have been edited by Fehr, *Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, pp. 241, 243–7.

⁸⁴ Bethurum (p. 346) notes that Wulfstan may have been responsible for creating the shortened version of Abbo's text.

⁸⁵ Abbo's sermon and its Old English translation have been edited by Bethurum and printed as Appendix I in her edition, pp. 366–73.

⁸⁶ Fehr prints only the first and last sentences of the Latin homily; see *Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, p. 247. The Old English homily, which is extant only in W, is also unedited; one paragraph of the text is cited and translated by Bedingfield, 'Public Penance', p. 254.

⁸⁷ Bethurum, p. 344. Frantzen, *Literature of Penance*, p. 161, refers to *Sermo in .XL.* as 'notes' for a homily.

⁸⁸ Bethurum, p. 344.

Although not a direct translation, Wulfstan's sermon is based on the same Latin original as the anonymous Old English Ash Wednesday homily in W, which it resembles in both content and structure. The primary difference lies in the intended audience of each: *Sermo in .XL.* seems addressed to the people at large, and although the Latin text is also rubricated as a *sermo ad populum*,⁸⁹ it is in fact directed to an exclusively clerical audience. That audience was most likely made up of canons rather than monks, for although the homilist addresses his audience as 'brothers' (*fratres*), he refers to himself and them together as God's preachers. Both sermons begin with general admonitions concerning Lent and proceed to the correct observance of the Lenten fast with special attention to the dangers of drunkenness.⁹⁰ Each makes use of the analogy between the ritual of public penance and Adam's expulsion from paradise, his suffering both on earth and in hell, and his readmittance to bliss; and each concludes with a description of public penance and the dismissal ritual in particular.⁹¹

Wulfstan is careful to include not only the public penitents, but all Christians, in his analogy of the expulsion of Adam:⁹² all of the congregation is called upon to pay tithes to make up for the sins of the year, to fast, to give alms, and to go to church daily for mass; the hardships imposed by the Lenten fast on all are thus analogous to the hardships and toil of Adam cast out of paradise. In the case of the public penitents cast out of the congregation, the analogy is more specific and the hardships greater, but clearly the penitential, Adamic experience is intended as a communal undertaking in which *sceal manna gehwylc hine sylfne georne beðencan 7 don swa him þearf is, andettan þa misdæda þe he mid him sylfum wat 7 georne betan* (Bethurum 234/29–31, 'each person should think about himself and do as is necessary for him, confess the misdeeds that he knows about himself and atone for them earnestly').

In the same way, Wulfstan uses Abbo's work in *Sermo de cena domini* to develop the analogy between Adam's experience and the experience of the penitents in greater detail and to draw lessons from that analogy for every member of his audience, both sinners undergoing public penance and members of the general congregation. As is his customary practice, Wulfstan shortens Abbo's text to sharpen the focus of the homily: he eliminates Abbo's repetitions and rhetorical questions, as well as his listing of the ten commandments and all but one of his biblical quotations. In addition, Wulfstan condenses Abbo's description of the joys of Adam in paradise by omitting two early references to Adam's sin, thus intensifying the contrast with his sorrow and repentance after his expulsion.⁹³ Throughout, Wulfstan sharpens the comparison between

⁸⁹ Fehr, *Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, p. 247.

⁹⁰ Bethurum notes that the reference to drunkenness in Wulfstan's sermon 'has particular pertinence' owing to the (deserved or not) reputation of the English canons and monks for heavy drinking (p. 344n). If so, it is even more pertinent to the audience of the Latin text.

⁹¹ In its manuscript context, the Latin homily is part of an *ordine* for the Ash Wednesday service, containing directions for both the ashing of and dismissal of penitents. See Fehr, *Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, p. 247.

⁹² See Bedingfield, *The Dramatic Liturgy*, p. 87.

⁹³ See *ibid.*, pp. 85–6, for a comparison of this passage in Wulfstan's homily and Abbo's.

Adam's experience and that of the penitents: like Adam, all human beings are created in God's likeness; Adam is placed in paradise after his creation because of his holiness and goodness (*for his halignesne 7 for his godnesse*, Bethurum 237/30–1), and people attain a like state of holiness through baptism, the point at which they formally enter into the community of the church. When God expels Adam from paradise, he acts as *ealra bisceopa bisceop* (236/19–20, 'bishop of all bishops', translating Abbo's *episcopus episcoporum*); after Adam's life of repentance on earth and his misery after death in hell, Christ leads him into *þære heofonlican cyrican* (236/24–5, 'the heavenly church') just as the bishop leads the penitents into church on Maundy Thursday.

Bishops, Wulfstan tells his audience, were established in the world to educate the people according to Christ's example and his teachings. They follow Christ's example by bringing people into the church as Christ brought Adam into paradise, and they teach that people are holy through the grace of baptism and should attend church regularly and keep the fast. But if capital sins are committed, then it is important for all Christians to understand the necessity of the expulsion of the sinners and the open penance that they are required to undergo. And just as the sin, expulsion, and reconciliation are public, so the sinner must perform the penance publicly, *swa biscop him tæce* (Bethurum 238/66, 'as the bishop teaches him'): *And ðeah æfre swa se man sy swyðor forsingod, swa he geornor 7 gelomor Godes hus sece dæges 7 nihtes 7 cneowige þær ute oft 7 gelome 7 clypige to Criste geomerendum mode 7 talige hine sylfne wið God swa forworhtne þæt he wyrðe ne sy þæt he gan mote into Godes huse* (Bethurum 237/51–238/55; 'And the more grievously the person has sinned, the more earnestly and often he will seek God's house day and night and kneel there outside often and again and call out to Christ with a sorrowing mind and count himself so thoroughly condemned by God that he is unworthy to go into God's house'). Thus the entire process – from its beginnings in the Ash Wednesday dismissal through the public lamentation of the penitents to its end in the Maundy Thursday reconciliation – is enacted as dramatic spectacle, played out not only to cleanse the souls of those who have committed capital sins, but also to educate the faithful as to the nature of repentance. The dramatic, publicly performed penance of the worst sinners is meant to be reflected in the 'secret' penance of those who have committed 'secret' sins. The dismissal ritual symbolizes the fact that all sin cuts the sinner off from God; the outward display of the public sinners' repentance mirrors the inward repentance of secret sinners keeping the Lenten fast; and the reconciliation ritual symbolizes the successful completion of both public and 'secret' penance in preparation for the joy of the Easter resurrection. The plural pronouns in the final lines of Wulfstan's homily, conventional as the words may be, underscore the communal nature of the process: *Eala, leofan men, utan don ealle swa swa us þearf is, utan helpan ure sylfra, 7 utan anmodlice eallum mode gebugan to Criste 7 earnian his miltse swa we geornost magon* (Bethurum 238/69–72, 'Oh, beloved people, let us do all that is necessary for us, let us help ourselves, and let us steadfastly turn in all our minds to Christ and earn his mercy as we most earnestly may').

How often such a ritual was actually carried out in Anglo-Saxon England is impossible to say. The liturgical forms were available to a large number of bishops; however, there is no evidence that any bishop with the possible exception of Wulfstan made use of them. The abbreviated nature of Wulfstan's Ash Wednesday homily, coupled with the fact that both it and *Sermo de cena domini* are extant in a single manuscript, indicates that they probably did not circulate as widely as the archbishop's other sermons, and this also speaks against frequent usage of public penance. It is possible that the sermons were composed for use on a single, perhaps extraordinary, occasion, and that Wulfstan hoped his contemporaries would adopt the practice.

The extraordinary times of the early eleventh century also called for extraordinary penitential measures, and the Viking invasions of 1009–12 prompted Wulfstan to call for nationwide, communal penance. VII Æthelred, the so-called 'penitential edict', was issued at a meeting of the *witan* at Bath in 1009; it decreed a three-day penitential fast accompanied by large-scale almsgiving to be performed on the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Michaelmas,⁹⁴ as well as providing specific penalties for noncompliance. The earliest extant text is contained in the Latin *Quadripartitus*;⁹⁵ however, a shorter English version (Napier 39) with some variation in the order of its provisions survives in C.⁹⁶ Taken together, the Latin and Old English versions provide a striking example of Wulfstan's conception of the interrelatedness of legal and homiletic writing. In Clare Lees's words, the penitential edict effectively 'resituates the moral discourse of [Anglo-Saxon] sermons on the efficacy of Christian behavior within legal discourse', adding that such a rhetorical move must inevitably 'produce . . . homilies'.⁹⁷ And in fact Wulfstan used the penitential edict to write two homilies: one with no specified audience (Napier 35, extant in C and E)⁹⁸ and one addressed to priests, part of which survives as an interpolation into the G text of the *Institutes of Polity*.⁹⁹

Patrick Wormald has demonstrated that in the move from legal edict to homily, each successive version is generalized a step further, until 'What had begun as royal law was converted into a renewable cycle of reactions to disaster'.¹⁰⁰ The process of generalization from *Quadripartitus* to Napier 35 is

⁹⁴ The year 1009 is not specified in the Latin text of the edict, although it appears in the translation. 1009 was, however, the only year between 998 and 1015 in which Michaelmas fell on a Thursday. See Wormald, *Making of English Law*, p. 331n; Keynes, *Diplomas*, p. 217n.

⁹⁵ See Liebermann, *Quadripartitus: Ein englisches Rechtsbuch von 1114* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1892); Patrick Wormald, 'Quadripartitus', in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. George Garnett and John Hudson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 111–47.

⁹⁶ For the Latin text, see Wormald, *Making of English Law*, p. 331. Both Bethurum (p. 38) and Wilcox ('Dissemination', p. 201n) agree that Wulfstan is the author of Napier 39, but regard it (correctly) as non-homiletic. Simon Keynes points out that the English text probably originated as Wulfstan's draft, augmented and reordered to produce an 'official' Latin version. See 'An Abbot, an Archbishop, and the Viking Raids of 1006–7 and 1009–12', *Anglo-Saxon England* 36 (2007), 151–220, at p. 180.

⁹⁷ Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, p. 15.

⁹⁸ For the relationship between Napier 35 and its variant Napier 36, see Chapter 3.

⁹⁹ Jost, *Polity*, pp. 167–9.

¹⁰⁰ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, p. 332. See also Keynes, 'An Abbot', p. 189.

best seen through the introductory sentences of each text: the Latin version begins *Hoc instituerunt Æþelredus rex et sapientes eius apud Badum*¹⁰¹ ('This was instituted by King Æthelred and his *witan* at Bath'), whereas the vernacular translation in Napier 39 strips the edict of both king and place, reading only *Dis man gerædde ða se micela here com to lande* (Napier 180/18–19, 'This was decreed when the great army came to the land').¹⁰² Napier 35 is yet more generalized: no longer tied to the particular circumstance of the Danish invasions, the homily carries the vague rubric *Be mistlican gelimpan* ('Concerning various events') and begins by recommending a communal fast *Gyfhit geweorðe, þæt on þeodscype becume healic ungelimp for manna gewyrhtan* (169/15–16, 'if it happens that in the nation there occur terrible events because of people's deeds'), specifying such disasters as war, famine, pestilence, and crop failures. Not only is the specific time frame of the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Michaelmas abandoned, but the fast described in the E text of the homily is no longer mandated as lasting for three days; depending upon need it could be shorter or longer (*hwilum læs hwilum ma be þam þe seo neod sy*, 170n). What is important is that the people remember the mercy of God as demonstrated in the story of the Ninevites, who *wæron forsyngode swyðe, ac hy dydan, swa heom þearf wæs, gewendan to rihte fram eallum unrihte and fengan on fæsten and ðingedan georne geomerigendum mode, and þæt mæg to bysne* (170/11–14, 'were great sinners, but did as was necessary for themselves, turned to the right from all wrong and fasted and prayed earnestly with sorrowing minds, and let that be an example').

Wormald does not, however, note that another text, printed by Jost as Appendix A of the *Institutes of Polity*, also takes up the theme of communal penance and generalizes it still further. Although the text is rubricated *Be godes þeowum* in G and presented in the manuscript as a chapter of *Polity*, it is clearly the opening of a homily designed for oral delivery: the fragment begins with *Leofan men* and continues with an exhortation for its audience to *gehyrað, hwæt ic wyll secgan*¹⁰³ ('listen to what I will say'). That the homily is addressed to priests is evidenced by Wulfstan's statement that although it is greatly necessary (*mycel þearf*) for all Christians to follow God's law and receive his teachings, it is most necessary (*mæst þearf*) for those in holy orders, who have the responsibility both to preach and to set an example for other people.¹⁰⁴ Specifically, priests are instructed to tell the faithful that in the event of a national or community disaster, the remedy is to be sought through communal penitential practices, that is, *mid clænlicum fæstenum 7 mid cyrcsocnum 7 mid eadmedum benum 7 mid ælmessylenum*¹⁰⁵ ('through pure fasting and church-going and humble prayers and almsgiving'). The injunction

¹⁰¹ VII Æthelred, Prologue; cited by Wormald, *Making of English Law*, p. 331.

¹⁰² Cf. Wormald, *Making of English Law*, pp. 331–2: 'it was no longer what a ruler did in a recollected spatial context, and became what was agreed in a predicament that must at all costs not recur. It was no longer the law of a king who was thoroughly discredited by the time the collection in Corpus 201 was put together.'

¹⁰³ Jost, *Polity*, p. 167.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 167.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

is wholly divorced from both the wording of the penitential edict and the specific danger of the Danish invasions; rather, the idea of communal penance is incorporated into a set of general instructions for the clergy: it is preceded by an exhortation for priests to teach Christianity properly and to set an example of good Christian behavior in their own lives, and it is followed by a reminder that priests should be steadfast and united, as if they have *cor unum & animam unam*¹⁰⁶ ('a single heart and a single spirit').

Lees observes that Wulfstan's call for communal penance in the edict and homilies can be seen as 'plausible' only insofar as the 'Preaching and hagiography of this period map out the practice of Christian belief'.¹⁰⁷ To the obviously didactic homilies and saints lives specified by Lees should also be added the penitential literature, which 'becomes catechetical', as Allen Frantzen notes, 'when its immediate subject is seen in the larger Christian framework'.¹⁰⁸ But if the idea that communal penance can affect the fate of the nation is plausible only by virtue of the faith instilled through the catechism and the lessons and practices outlined in various genres of ecclesiastical literature, it should also be remembered that the purpose of both penitential and catechetical writing is essentially the same: to teach 'the "how" of good behavior as well as the "what" of right doctrine'.¹⁰⁹ For Wulfstan, concerned as he was not only with the response of the English to the Danish invasions, but also with the preparation of his society for the greatest disaster of all, it was imperative that the catechetical benefits of both private and public penance be supplemented by the habit of communal penance at need.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 169.

¹⁰⁷ Lees, *Tradition and Belief*, p. 3.

¹⁰⁸ Frantzen, *Literature of Penance*, p. 152.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 152.

The Danish Invasions and the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*

WULFSTAN'S RESPONSE to the Viking invasions did not, of course, end with the penitential edict of 1009. To further underscore the need for radical penance on both an individual and communal basis, Wulfstan turned to the Old Testament and the tribulations of the Israelites to find a precedent for the sufferings of the English and the remedy for such suffering in penitential actions. One of the earliest of Wulfstan's writings to make use of the Old Testament analogy is a series of Latin excerpts from Isaiah and Jeremiah, followed by English translations and supplemented by a few commonplace homiletic sentiments. *Incipit de visione Isaie prophete quam vidit super Iudam et Heirusalem* ('Here begins the vision seen by the prophet Isaiah concerning Judah and Jerusalem'; Bethurum XI; Napier 6) survives in three manuscripts. The full text is extant only in E; in C the text breaks off in the middle of the last translation from Jeremiah owing to a missing page in the manuscript, while in Cop the Latin text survives only up to the penultimate quotation from Jeremiah. The *De visione Isaie* immediately precedes *De septiformi spiritu* in both C and E, following the *Sermo de baptisate* in E and *Her onginneð be cristendome* in C. In Cop, the Latin quotations are followed by a homiletic fragment in Wulfstan's handwriting that begins with a sentence linking the fragment to the quotation from Jeremiah. As noted in Chapter 2, Wulfstan added to the fragment at least once and possibly twice, suggesting that although Wulfstan apparently never revised his translations into a fully structured homily, he continued to toy with the idea of composing a sermon based on the quotations.

Bethurum prints the *De visione Isaie* among the catechetical homilies, despite the fact that it is neither structured as a homily nor especially catechetical; Thomas Hall has somewhat generously suggested that the reason for its inclusion lies in the *De visione Isaie*'s importance for the study of Wulfstan's prose style,¹ which is exceptionally alliterative and rhythmic in this work. Bethurum speculates that Wulfstan chose the excerpts and made the translations relatively early in his career, perhaps as an 'exercise in rhythmical composition' before he settled into his mature style; Patrick Wormald's chronology, in contrast, places the *De visione Isaie* somewhat later, perhaps

¹ Bethurum, pp. 211–20; Thomas N. Hall, 'Wulfstan's Latin Sermons', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 93–139, at p. 96.

between 1009 and 1014,² and certainly the content of the translations would make these dates seem more fitting. In that case, Wulfstan's experimentation with a more self-consciously poetic style in the translations was most likely an attempt to develop a heightened form of rhetoric to provide the intensity of expression the times required.

The quotations themselves are clearly shaped for homiletic expression: Wulfstan did not simply copy contiguous portions of Isaiah and Jeremiah; rather, he chose and adapted the verses to create the exhortations and sequences he desired for his English audience. In the first excerpt from Isaiah, for example, Wulfstan uses part of 1: 1 for his rubric, but omits details that would dilute his purpose in adapting the prophet's exhortations to current events, such as the name of Isaiah's father and those of the kings of Judah. He uses all of 1: 2, in which God states that his chosen people have rebelled and become estranged from him, but omits 1: 3, with its comparison between the ox and ass that know their masters and the nation of Israel, which does not. He uses the second half of 1: 4, in which Isaiah describes the Israelites as having forsaken their Lord, moves to 1: 7 with its description of cities burned and made desolate by foreign invaders, and then to 1: 15, in which God tells the Israelites that he will not hear their prayers for assistance. Wulfstan ends the section by citing Isaiah 45: 22 with its promise, *conuertimini ad me et salui eritis* (Bethurum 211/13, 'turn to me and you will be saved'), a verse that acts as a refrain within the Isaiah series, coming at the end of each section. The following sections detail the specific sins that have brought calamity upon the Israelites: tyranny, pride, greed, gluttony, hypocrisy, perversions of the law and justice, and reliance upon their own strength in war rather than upon God. The series ends with a return to the first chapter of Isaiah and a set of instructions for repentance and atonement in 1: 16–18: *Lauamini, mundi estote, auferte malum cogitationum uestrarum ab oculis meis. Quiescite agere peruerse; discite benefacere. Querite iudicium, subuenite obpresso, iudicate pupillo, defendite uiduam* (Bethurum 213/69–72, 'Wash yourselves, make yourselves clean, remove the evil of your thoughts from my eyes. Cease to do evil; learn to do good. Seek justice, correct oppression, defend the orphan, defend the widow'). So structured, the series could refer to the English during the Viking invasions as easily as to the Israelites, and it is not difficult to imagine the homily that Wulfstan could have written. If he did write such a homily, however, it has not survived.

Similarly, *Be godcundre warnung* (Bethurum XIX; Napier 28) largely comprises a series of warnings from Leviticus 26, but is written in what Bethurum calls a 'more mature' style, featuring a less obtrusive rhythm and 'proportionately more rhyme and less alliteration'.³ The text also differs from the *De visione Isaie* in that its quotations are fully integrated into a homiletic structure. *Be godcundre warnung* is extant in C, G, and I: both G and I have the rubric, but only I begins the homily with a barred L to indicate *Leofan men*. C is lacking both the rubric and the closing sentence; the homily begins at the end of

² Wormald, 'Eleventh-Century State Builder', p. 26.

³ Bethurum, p. 354.

Napier homily 34 with no line break to indicate a new text. Bethurum notes that the C text is 'significantly' different from G and I in a number of lines and thus 'represents a different version';⁴ however, the differences do not radically alter either the content or the style of the homily.

As in the *De visione Isaie*, Wulfstan carefully chooses verses from Leviticus 26 to omit the specific details of the Israelites' situation and to stress the prophet's warnings concerning famine, invasions, war, and the resulting devastation of the land; at times he condenses the biblical text to obtain the generalized exhortations he is looking for. In addition, the translation is far from exact: not only does Wulfstan adapt the text for an English audience in terms of its depictions of social relationships,⁵ but he also translates selectively to emphasize the destruction of a nation through crop failures and invading armies, precisely the problems facing the English in the second decade of the eleventh century. The lesson of the homily is simple – take as an example what has happened in the past to those who kept God's law and to those who did not – but it is a lesson shaped to apply to a specific audience at a specific time.

The period of the Danish invasions was also, of course, the time when Wulfstan wrote his best-known and arguably his best-written homily. The full text of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* (Bethurum XX; Napier 33)⁶ is extant in three versions in five manuscripts. The longest, most complete text appears in E and I, C has a somewhat shorter version, while B and H preserve a version that is shorter still. Two other severely abbreviated versions also deserve notice, although they are seldom mentioned in discussions of the sermon:⁷ Napier 27 carries the rubric *To eallum folce* and is extant in C and N, while a different, even shorter abbreviation is contained in B, where it makes up the first half of a text rubricated *Larspel and Scriftboc* (Napier 47); the second half is a consideration of the timing of the end of the world and the eight capital sins composed by Byrhtferth of Ramsey.⁸ The full rubric of the homily, *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos quando Dani maxime persecuti sunt eos, quod fuit anno millesimo .xiii. ab incarnatione domini nostri Iesu Christi* ('The sermon of Wolf to the English when the Danes were persecuting them most severely, which was in the year 1014 from the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ'), comes from I; the rubric in C is identical with the exception of the date, which reads *millesimo .viii.*, that is, 1009 rather than 1014. E omits the precise date, substituting *in dies Æþelredi regis* ('in the days of King Æthelred'), although an 'early modern'⁹ hand has supplied 'Anno Christi 1009' in the margin. The short version is rubricated *Larspell* in B and *Sermo* in H. Most scholars have agreed that 1014 is accurate on the grounds that Wulfstan himself corrected

⁴ Ibid., p. 21.

⁵ Ibid., p. 354.

⁶ The additional edition by Dorothy Whitelock is based on the text in E and I.

⁷ Jonathan Wilcox's discussions are an exception. See especially 'Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* as Political Performance: 16 February 1014 and Beyond', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 374–96, at pp. 392–3.

⁸ The passage from Byrhtferth is taken from the end of the *Enchiridion* and is also extant in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ashmole 328.

⁹ Identified as such by Simon Keynes, 'An Abbot', p. 209n.

the texts and many of the rubrics in I,¹⁰ arguing that the reading in C could stem from an 'x' being misread as a 'v' sometime in the course of transmission, perhaps by the C scribe himself. However, although in I the letter in question is clearly an 'x'; the date is written over an erasure, and it is at least possible that the correction changes the date from 1009, a year in which the invasion of England by Thorkell the Tall met with an ineffectual English defense, to 1014, a year in which persecution by the Danes was far less severe. If so, the implications for the date at which Wulfstan began writing the sermon are clear, although he could not have finished the work until after 1013 when Æthelred was expelled from England.

In three of the five manuscripts the *Sermo Lupi* follows texts connected with Wulfstan's writings on bishops¹¹ and is followed by variously rubricated versions of *Her is gyt rihtlic warnung* (Bethurum XXI; Napier 34): I, where the *Sermo Lupi* follows a short text rubricated *Be peodwitan*, edited by Jost as part of the *Institutes of Polity*, and the following text is rubricated *Her is gyt rihtlic warnung 7 soðlic mynung peode to þearfe. Gyne se þe wille*; E, where it follows the second part of *Lectio secundum Lucam*, rubricated *Be godes bydelum*, and the following text is rubricated *Her is gyt rihtlic warnung*; and C, where it follows a four-line humility formula that is usually part of the *Lectio secundum Lucam* and the following text is also rubricated *Sermo Lupi*. In B, the *Sermo Lupi* follows a non-Wulfstanian homily rubricated *Sermonem angelorum nomina* (Napier 45) and is followed by Wulfstan's *Sermo de baptisate*, while in H it follows Wulfstan's eschatological homily *Secundum Marcum* and is followed by *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi*, here rubricated simply *Sermones*.

The differences between the three full versions may be summarized as follows. BH is 131 lines long in Bethurum's edition; it lacks Wulfstan's description of the Danish humiliations of the English found in EI at Bethurum lines 100–28 and in C at 97–126, and is in fact missing any reference to the Viking invasions *per se*. It does, however, include a clause referring to Æthelred's exile that is missing in C, E, and I. Whereas all five manuscripts read *7 ful micel hlaforðswice eac bið on worolde þæt man his hlaforð of life forræde oððon of lande lifienðne drife; 7 ægþer is geworden on þysan earde. Eadweard man forrædde 7 syððan acwealde 7 æfter þam forbærnde*¹² ('and there is also very great betrayal of lords in the world when a man deprives his lord of life or drives him living from the land. Edward was betrayed and afterwards killed and after that burned'); only B and H continue with *7 Æpelred man dræfde ut of his earde* (Bethurum 258/71, 'and Æthelred was driven out of his land'). The Æthelred clause is necessary for the completion of the sentence and is thus most likely original; it has become a central concern of scholars attempting to ascertain the order and date of the three versions.

The C text runs to 178 lines, amplifying Wulfstan's descriptions of the

¹⁰ Ker ('Handwriting') does not list the date as one of Wulfstan's corrections; however, as Wulfstan's hand is evident throughout the manuscript, Ker lists only the larger additions.

¹¹ For a full discussion of the manuscript contexts, see Wilcox, 'The Wolf on Shepherds', pp. 395–418.

¹² Bethurum, BH, pp. 257/67–258/71; C, p. 263/79–83; EI, p. 270/74–8.

sins of the English and including a long passage on the Viking depredations (Bethurum 263/97–264/126). Somewhat more doubtful is the second sentence of the homily: *Bis wæs on Æðelredes cyninges dagum gediht, feower geara fæce ær he forðferde. Gime se ðe wille hu hit þa wære 7 hwæt siððan gewurde* (261/9–12, 'This was made in the days of king Æthelred, four years time before he died. Let him who will believe how it was then and what happened afterwards').¹³ 'Four years' is obviously a mistake whether the sermon is dated 1009 as in C or 1014 as in I; *feower* may be a scribal error for *feawa*, 'a few'.¹⁴ Malcolm Godden comments that although the addition is probably scribal, the source may in fact be Wulfstan himself: not only is the sentence a translation and expansion of the rubric in E, but *Gime se ðe wille* is both a standard Wulfstanian phrase and the very words added in the Wulfstan hand to the rubric that follows the *Sermo Lupi* in I.¹⁵ A second doubtful passage is a lamentation that reads as if it were written after the homily proper and is most likely a scribal comment, since it refers to the sermon as a *ræding* ('reading, lesson, narrative'): *Eala, micel magon manega git heretoeacan eaðe beþencan þæs þe ic ana on rædinge ne mihte fulllice asmeagan, hu earmlice hit gefaran is nu ealle hwile innan þisse earman forsingodre þeode* (Bethurum 265/158–62; 'Alas, many might easily think yet more besides that I alone cannot fully examine in this reading, about how miserably it has proceeded now all the time within this wretched sinning nation'). However, this too may have Wulfstan as its ultimate source, for it may be based on a misreading of Wulfstan's corresponding statement in EI, that there is more that *an man ne mehte on hrædinge asmeagan* (274/170–1, 'one person cannot examine in haste'). Bethurum also questions the text's relatively lengthy expansion on the violations of *freorih*t, *þrælriht*, and *ælmesriht* (262/49–56), although she notes that it 'gives useful information which, if not Wulfstan's, was probably contemporary with him'.¹⁶ Finally, she sees lines 167–8 as 'a poor imitation of Wulfstan's alliteration': *Uton creopan to Criste 7 bifigendre heortan clipian gelome 7 geearnian his mildse* ('Let us crawl to Christ and with repentant hearts cry out often and earn his mercy'), although given the sermon's strong theme of repentance, Stephanie Hollis believes the sentence may be authentic.¹⁷

The texts of E and I are not identical, but the differences are fairly minor. The scribe of I may have been working from an exemplar with marginal additions: he makes a false start at line 85, realizes he has omitted a fairly lengthy sentence, and starts again; in addition, the text has been corrected by Wulfstan, who wrote a marginal addition at line 79. EI brings the sermon up to 202 lines through a number of expansions, including one of Wulfstan's lists of sinners and, most importantly, a longer passage translated in part from a letter of Alcuin to Æthelhard¹⁸ (extant in X and in Oxford, Bodleian

¹³ Bethurum (p. 23) says the sentence is 'probably not genuine'.

¹⁴ Whitelock, *Sermo Lupi*, p. 6.

¹⁵ Malcolm Godden, 'Apocalypse and Invasion', pp. 160–1. If Wulfstan is indeed the source, the sentence would suggest that the C version was composed after the EI text.

¹⁶ Bethurum, p. 23.

¹⁷ Stephanie Hollis, 'The Thematic Structure of the *Sermo Lupi*', *Anglo-Saxon England* 6 (1977), 175–95, at p. 188.

¹⁸ See *Alcuini epistolae*, ed. E. Dumler, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae Carolini Aevi*

Library, Barlow 37), which cites Gildas's *De exidio Britanniae* and describes the conquest of the Britons by the English (Bethurum 274/174–86):

Ac la, on Godes naman utan don swa us neod is, beorgan us sylfum swa we geornost magan þe læs we ætgædere ealle forweorðan. An þeodwita wæs on Brytta tidum Gildas hatte. Se awrat be heora misdædum hu hy mid heora synnum swa oferlice swyþe God gegræmedan þæt he let æt nyhstan Engla here heora eard gewinnan 7 Brytta duguþe fordon mid ealle. And þæt wæs geworden þæs þe he sæde, þurh ricra reaflac 7 þurh gitsunge wohgestreona, ðurh leode unlaga 7 þurh wohdomas, ðurh biscopa asolcennesse 7 þurh lyðre yrhðe Godes bydela þe soþes geswugedan ealles to gelome 7 clumedan mid ceafum þær hy scoldan clypian. Þurh fulne eac folces gælsan 7 þurh oferfylla 7 mænigfealde synna heora eard hy forworhtan 7 selfe hy forwurdan.

But oh, in the name of God let us do as is necessary for us, protect ourselves as we most eagerly may, lest we all perish together. There was a wise man of the nation in the time of the Britons called Gildas. He wrote about their misdeeds, how they angered God overmuch with their sins so that at last he allowed the English army to conquer their land and destroy the host of the Britons entirely. And that happened, as he said, through great theft and through greed for ill-gotten property, through a lawless people and through unjust judgments, through the laziness of bishops and through the evil cowardice of God's preachers who were silent about the truth all too often and who mumbled in their jaws where they should call out. Also through the foul lust of the people and through gluttony and manifold sins they forfeited their land and destroyed themselves.

Like the Æthelred clause, the Gildas passage is significant in determining the order in which the three versions of the sermon were written, as well as for the larger thematic implications of the sermon as a whole.

The relationship among the various versions, particularly the order of composition, has become a vexed question in recent years; therefore, it may be helpful to give a brief review of the various arguments. Both Bethurum and Whitelock consider the short version in B and H to be the earliest, assuming the Æthelred clause to have been revised out of the homily when Wulfstan composed the longer versions; Bethurum notes that a reference to Æthelred's exile might have been politically 'unwise' to retain if the homily were revised and expanded after Cnut came to power.¹⁹ She places the C version as the first revision, after which she argues that the homily was expanded a second time to produce the version extant in E and I. Nevertheless, Bethurum concludes that were it not for 'the incomplete sentence of 77–8', that is, the omission of the clause concerning Æthelred's exile and the 'imperfectly joined' Gildas passage, 'It would be quite possible to reverse the reasoning' and see the process as one of abbreviation rather than expansion, with the EI version being written first.²⁰

In the 1970s Stephanie Dien Hollis published two articles doing just that.²¹

11 (Hanover, 1895), 42–4; translated in Dorothy Whitelock, ed., *English Historical Documents*, vol. I, c.500–1041 (2nd edn, London: Routledge, 1979), pp. 842–4.

¹⁹ Bethurum, p. 22.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

²¹ Hollis, 'Thematic Structure'; Stephanie Dien [Hollis], 'Sermo Lupi ad Anglos: The Order and Date of the Three Versions', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 76 (1975), 561–70.

Although agreeing that the Æthelred clause is original, she dismisses the idea that Wulfstan would have omitted it out of political considerations: 'It is hard to imagine, without being unduly cynical, that the man who spoke with such scorn of bishops who mumble in their jaws when they should cry out' would omit this instance of the nation's treachery in order to avoid offending Cnut'.²² Moreover, because the sermon as a whole would no longer have been preached after 1016 and thus neither the C nor the EI versions could possibly have been written after Cnut's accession, Hollis argues that Wulfstan was unlikely to have intentionally deleted the reference either for a later revision or for manuscripts copied after the Danish conquest;²³ therefore, its inclusion in B and H 'proves merely that the [BH] archetype was almost certainly not the same as that of EI and C', which Bethurum's stemma already indicates.²⁴ Hollis also takes up the question of Bethurum's objection to the way in which the Gildas passage is incorporated into the sermon, noting that the problem lies in the fact that the sentence immediately preceding the Gildas passage *Ac la, on Godes naman utan don swa us þearfis, beorgan us sylfum swa we geornost magan þe læs we ætgædere ealle forweorðan* (Bethurum 274/174–6, 'But oh, in God's name let us do what is necessary for us, protect ourselves as we most earnestly can, lest we all be condemned together') would appear to be meant as an introduction to Wulfstan's 'customary conclusion'.²⁵ After correcting Bethurum's error in transcription – the manuscripts read *uton don swa us neod is* – Hollis cites as counter evidence the example of the Pastoral Letter to prove that the clause does not always immediately lead to the conclusion of a Wulfstan homily.²⁶

More important, however, are Hollis's logical and stylistic objections to Bethurum's conclusions. Noting that BH does not mention the humiliations suffered by the English at the hands of the Danes, or indeed the Danish invasions themselves, she concludes that 'it is difficult to believe . . . that it did not occur to Wulfstan that the threat of destruction by the Danes implicit in EI 176–90 would be an "apt addition" until he had written two drafts of the sermon and discovered a reference to Gildas's indictment of the Britons'.²⁷ Moreover, although the omission of the Æthelred clause already shows that the version in EI does not reflect the original sermon in its entirety, through a close stylistic analysis of the longest version of the sermon, Hollis is able to pinpoint passages in BH that must have been added later, for their omission restores Wulfstan's complex and sophisticated verbal and structural effects within the homily.²⁸ The result adds further support for Hollis's thesis, as such an exquisitely crafted text was most likely composed as a whole, rather than built up piecemeal.

²² Dien, 'Sermo Lupi', p. 565.

²³ Ibid., pp. 564–5.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 564; Bethurum, p. 23.

²⁵ Bethurum, p. 23.

²⁶ Dien, 'Sermo Lupi', p. 563.

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 562–3; 'apt addition' is from Bethurum, p. 23.

²⁸ See, especially, Dien, 'Sermo Lupi', pp. 566–7; Hollis, 'Thematic Structure', pp. 183, 189, 195–6.

In 1994 Malcolm Godden revived the earlier hypothesis, listing five basic points as the grounds for his reasoning:

1. The longest version is clearly Wulfstan's own work throughout, since one of the two manuscripts in which it survives, British Library Cotton Nero A.i, is annotated and corrected in Wulfstan's own hand.
2. Successive expansion through a series of versions is a well-documented characteristic of his work, seen in a number of other texts.
3. The Nero manuscript [i.e., I] in fact preserves traces of the process of expansion in its text of a passage on sexual abuses which is unique to the longest version: the scribe seems initially to have missed the additional passage he was meant to copy but then saw his mistake, stopped and copied the new passage, and then continued with the original text.
4. The short version seems internally coherent as an autonomous text, and in its concerns and emphases relates closely to Wulfstan's own earlier eschatological homilies . . .
5. The close relation of this short version to the original form of the sermon is demonstrated by its unique inclusion of a clause referring to Æthelred's expulsion, which must have been in the original Wulfstan text that lies behind all three versions, since the preceding sentences in all of them lead up to it.²⁹

Once again a major element in Godden's argument is the missing Æthelred clause in C and EI, the deletion of which Hollis had attributed to scribal error. Godden points out that if so, it would have been highly improbable that 'Wulfstan himself failed to notice the error despite the fact that, on [Hollis's] account, he subsequently revised the sermon at least three times'.³⁰ More likely, in Godden's view, is the hypothesis that the clause was removed when Wulfstan expanded the version in BH sometime in early 1014, after the death of Svein prompted the *witan* to recall the exiled king.³¹ In addition, the verbal correspondences between BH and Wulfstan's earliest homilies indicate to Godden that BH is not only the first version of the *Sermo Lupi* but also the last of the eschatological homilies, albeit with the significant difference that the disasters foretold in the earlier sermons are here cited in the past tense, as calamities that have already happened.³² Yet Godden recognizes that the presence of the Æthelred clause presents a problem with this hypothesis as well, stating that 'There is something perverse in citing the expulsion of Ethelred as an example of lord-betrayal without even hinting at the Viking invasions'.³³

Jonathan Wilcox took up the question again in 2005, arguing with Hollis for a process of abbreviation rather than expansion. According to Wilcox, Wulfstan probably first preached the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* at a meeting of the *witan* in York on 16 February 1014, the meeting having been called after the death of Svein when the members of the *witan* were already assembled for the episcopal consecration of Ælfwig on St Julian's day, thus accounting for the

²⁹ Godden, 'Apocalypse and Invasion', p. 144.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 147.

³¹ Ibid., p. 150.

³² Ibid., p. 146.

³³ Ibid., p. 148.

connection between the *Sermo Lupi* and Wulfstan's writings on bishops within the manuscripts.³⁴ Wilcox argues that the version of the sermon Wulfstan preached at York would have been close, but not identical, to that found in EI, the discrepancies being due to the archbishop's inveterate 'tinkering' with his writings.³⁵ Thus the first performance version would have contained the disputed Æthelred clause, but the clause was most likely deleted 'as a question of tact, and perhaps even accuracy' sometime after Æthelred returned as king and before his death in 1016.³⁶ Its appearance in BH, the last of the versions, is thus a restoration rather than a survival.

In answer to Godden's other points, Wilcox argues that: 1. because I was owned, annotated, and corrected by Wulfstan, its text of the *Sermo Lupi* has authority, but this fact does not necessarily make it the last version; 2. the circumstances of the sermon's performance make it likely that Wulfstan reversed his usual practice of expansion to abbreviate the text; 3. I is unlikely to demonstrate the processes the *Sermo Lupi*'s composition because the manuscript is probably a compilation assembled by Wulfstan late in his career, making any evidence of expansion within I an example of Wulfstan's 'tinkering'; and 4. the relationship between BH and Wulfstan's early eschatological homilies – after a gap of almost fourteen years – proves only that Wulfstan 'could return later in his career to certain fundamental preoccupations'.³⁷

Finally, Simon Keynes noted in 2007 that the solution to this problem, if we could know it, is probably more complicated than a simple shortest to longest or longest to shortest argument can encompass.³⁸ Given that the historical situation would argue for a date of original composition in 1009 rather than 1014, but that all three versions as we have them must have been written after 1013 because of the Æthelred clause, Keynes proposes a complex, if somewhat speculative, solution as a 'working hypothesis' that includes an early version of the sermon composed during the period 1009–12, now lost; a 'definitive' version composed in 1014, at which time Wulfstan composed the rubric with the date 1009 to indicate the year of the greatest Viking depredations, but which also included the Æthelred clause; a revised version from around the year 1020 that deleted the Æthelred clause but retained the 1009 date; further copies in which the date was changed to 1014; and further revisions that eventually resulted in the shorter C and BH texts.³⁹

Keynes's argument is certainly the most compelling to date, yet may be more complex than it needs to be. If Wulfstan began writing the *Sermo Lupi* in 1009 rather than 1014, then the original version may have looked something like C, albeit without the scribal interpolations. It would clearly have been missing the Æthelred clause, and, given that the clause fits seamlessly onto the end of its sentence, that sentence would probably have

³⁴ Wilcox, 'Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi*', pp. 380–2.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 388–9.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 389.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 390n.

³⁸ Keynes, 'An Abbot', p. 207.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 211.

been missing as well. When Wulfstan expanded the text into the EI version in 1014, perhaps polishing it for the consecration of Ælfric as Wilcox argues, he very likely could have altered the date to reflect the expansion at that time, not knowing that in hindsight 1014 would look far better than perhaps it did at the time. He would also have added a new list of sinners, the passage detailing the specifically sexual outrages committed by the English (perhaps based on an actual incident), and the Æthelred sentence – with the specific clause later deleted. After 1016, he would have reused portions he still found useful, creating the various abbreviations and restoring the Æthelred clause to BH.

Any argument concerning the date and order of the versions must of course be supported by thematic and historical concerns. For Hollis, the *Sermo Lupi* is primarily an eschatological homily. She asserts that ‘The central theme of the sermon . . . is outlined, as is usual in Wulfstan’s work, in the opening sentence’:⁴⁰ *Leofan men, gecnawað þæt soð is: ðeos worold is on ofste, ⁊ hit nealæcð þam ende, ⁊ þy hit is on worolde aa swa leng swa wyrse; ⁊ swa hit sceal nyde for folces synnan ær Antecristes tocyme yfelian swyfe, ⁊ huru hit wyrð þænne egeslic ⁊ grimlic wide on worolde.*⁴¹ (‘Beloved people, understand what is true: this world is in haste and it is nearing its end, and therefore the longer the world goes on, the worse it gets, and so it must become very evil because of people’s sins before Antichrist’s coming, and indeed it will then be terrible and grim widely in the world’). Hollis argues that this sentence ‘marks an advance in Wulfstan’s conception of the last days’, for rather than simply stating, as in the early eschatological homilies, that the coming of Antichrist is near and will be punishment for humanity’s sins, in the *Sermo Lupi* Wulfstan presents the advent of Antichrist ‘dynamically’, as ‘the climax of a progressive growth of afflictions which is proportionate to the increasing quantity of sin’.⁴² From this, Hollis infers that Wulfstan regards the Vikings not only as precursors to the advent of Antichrist, but as ‘antichrists’ themselves, using the term to designate the human agents of Antichrist, as Wulfstan does in the Latin version of *De Anticristo*.⁴³ The logical corollary to this dynamic process is that ‘the reign of Antichrist may also be postponed by a diminution of man’s sins’.⁴⁴ Thus, repentance and reform on the part of the English people have the potential not only to ward off the Viking attacks, but also to delay the end of the world, making the *Sermo Lupi* ‘the most optimistic of Wulfstan’s eschatological sermons’.⁴⁵

Hollis is on shaky ground here, both interpretatively and theologically. Wulfstan never explicitly identifies the Vikings with Antichrist (or as ‘antichrists’), nor does he mention Antichrist again in the sermon. Moreover, medieval Christian theology affords no hint that the Last Day may be postponed by

⁴⁰ Hollis, ‘Thematic Structure’, p. 184.

⁴¹ Bethurum, BH, p. 255/3–6; C, p. 261/7–9; EI, p. 267/7–11. BH and C end the sentence at *swyfe*.

⁴² Hollis, ‘Thematic Structure’, p. 185.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 198–9.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 186.

⁴⁵ Dien, p. 568n.

any means, as the day and the hour are already known to God (Matthew 24: 36). The *Sermo Lupi* is certainly linked to Wulfstan's early eschatological homilies through its repetition of phrases and sentences from those homilies, and on one level Wulfstan is designating the Viking incursions as part of the wars and rumors of war that will precede the advent of Antichrist. On a second level, however, Wulfstan is holding out the possibility that the attacks are in fact not the immediate precursors to the advent of Antichrist, but rather an intermediary punishment for the sins of the English that can be averted through repentance and atonement in whatever time remains before the end of the world.

Moreover, as *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi*, *Be godcundre warnung*, and the *De visione Isaie* make clear, Wulfstan was thinking of Old Testament parallels to the English situation well before writing the *Sermo Lupi*. Both the *De visione Isaie* and *Be godcundre warnung* draw an implicit comparison between the Israelites and the English, while *Incipiunt sermones* shows the history of the Israelites to be a continuing cycle of sin, punishment, atonement, and redemption. As Malcolm Godden points out, the 'Old Testament parallels suggest the cyclic repetition of divine punishment and repentance rather than the once-only end of all things; they imply divine anger with the chosen people rather than the destruction of the whole world'.⁴⁶ Such cyclical repetition becomes explicit in the passage containing Wulfstan's translation of Alcuin's letter, in which he compares the conquest of the Britons by the English, made possible by the sins of the Britons, to the impending conquest of the English by the Danes. Here Wulfstan makes use of the culminating event of what Nicholas Howe has termed the Anglo-Saxon 'migration myth', the idea that just as God guided the Israelites to the promised land, so he guided the Anglo-Saxons to the 'promised land' of Britain. The migration myth is primarily a myth of origins; nevertheless, as Howe points out, Wulfstan focuses here on endings rather than beginnings, on the defeat of the Britons rather than on the victory of the English.⁴⁷ For just as the Britons had been punished through invasion and defeat for their sins, so the English could be punished – and apparently were being punished – for their sins in precisely the same way.

Godden sees Wulfstan's use of the Old Testament paradigm and its corollary in the migration myth as an indication of a fundamental shift in Wulfstan's thinking about history that took place largely during the time the *Sermo Lupi* was composed and revised, and thus as support for his argument that Wulfstan's process of revision was one of expansion rather than abbreviation of his text: 'The sense of an approaching end of all things, so strong in the earlier homilies on the last days and still very evident in the first version of the sermon, gives way to a sense of the longer and continuing movement of

⁴⁶ Godden, 'Apocalypse and Invasion', p. 155. For a good discussion of the Old Testament paradigm in Anglo-Saxon thought, see Stephen Harris, *Race and Ethnicity in Anglo-Saxon Literature* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 107–12.

⁴⁷ Nicholas Howe, *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989; repr. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), p. 16.

history.⁴⁸ For Godden, the Old Testament paradigm with its cyclical view of history 'sits uneasily' within the eschatological framework constructed by the initial sentence of the sermon:

It is at odds with the Antichrist tradition, which conceives rather of a devil figure who is allowed to tempt or test mankind . . . its emphasis is tribal or national whereas apocalyptic is universal: that is, divine anger is directed against a particular nation for particular sins, often employing other nations as agents; apocalypse involves the tribulations of the whole world, though more particularly of the faithful.⁴⁹

The obvious question becomes why Wulfstan would have retained the explicit reference to Antichrist in the later versions of the sermon if his thinking had shifted in any fundamental way away from the eschatological to the historical, from the universal to the national, from the New Testament to the Old. Surely if Wulfstan had revised the BH version of the *Sermo Lupi* to deal exclusively with the Danish invasions in a context of cyclical, historical time with reference to the Old Testament and the migration myth, and if the new perspective sat uneasily with the old in his own mind, it would have been a simple matter to recast the framework by revising the initial sentence. Moreover, given Wulfstan's use of the Old Testament paradigm in *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi* – written contemporaneously with or immediately after the eschatological texts – the perceived shift in Wulfstan's thinking need not have been as new or even as fundamental as Godden's argument implies. Rather, as Nicholas Howe argues, it may simply suggest 'an intellectual openness not usually attributed to him . . . [and] his recognition that his earlier reliance on an abstract mode of preaching was inadequate for the crisis of the moment'.⁵⁰

Howe is on the right track, I believe, when he states that in the *Sermo Lupi* Wulfstan's 'eschatology . . . is powerful precisely because it stands in a complex tension with his sense of history'.⁵¹ That tension begins in the first paragraph of EI with Wulfstan's juxtaposition of the universal danger of Antichrist that exists *wide on worolde* (Bethurum 267/10, 'widely in the world') to the specific dangers facing *þas þeode* (267/17, 'this nation'); it is increased by Wulfstan's use of the past tense to enumerate the sins of the English, which would suggest that the time of Antichrist has come. Yet at the same time, Wulfstan proposes that those sins are the particular, local cause of the *fela byrsta 7 bysmara* (267/17–18, 'many injuries and insults') that the English have endured, and, as Hollis notes, he promises a temporal remedy: *Forþam mid miclan earnungan we geearnedan þa yrmða þe us onsittað, 7 mid swyþe micelan earnungan we þa bote motan æt Gode geræcan gif hit sceal heonanforð godiende weorðan* (267/20–268/23, 'For we have earned the misery that now oppresses us by greatly deserving it, and if it is to become better henceforth we must obtain the remedy from God by deserving it equally greatly'). Thus the two questions of whether the Danish

⁴⁸ Godden, 'Apocalypse and Invasion', p. 152.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 154.

⁵⁰ Howe, *Migration and Mythmaking*, pp. 18–19.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 13.

invasions are the inevitable precursor to the end of the world or a localized punishment for particular sins, and whether the English are to repent and atone for their sins in the face of imminent apocalypse or whether they are to do so in hope of an end to the Danish invasions remain open throughout the sermon. God will give the *bot* ('remedy') in either situation if the English mend their ways well enough, but both the nature of the situation and that of the *bot* remain ambiguous.

In the various catalogues of wrongdoing listed within the homily, Wulfstan returns repeatedly to two particularly invidious categories of sin: inversions of the proper order of society and the world, and treachery against lords, family, and nation. Both are characteristic of Antichrist, as Wulfstan makes clear in the eschatological homilies and *De septiformi spiritu*. The impiety of the English Christians is contrasted to the piety of the heathens in an inversion of what the Anglo-Saxons would have considered the proper order of the world; it is seemingly confirmed by the victories enjoyed by the Danes over the English. Wulfstan describes *flotmen swa strange þurh Godes þafunge þæt oft on gefeohte an feseð tyne 7 hwilum læs, hwilum ma* (Bethurum 271/111–13, 'ship-men so strong through God's permission that often one [man] fights and overcomes ten, sometimes fewer and sometimes more'), adding that *Oft tweegen sæmen oððe þry hwilum drifað þa drafæ cristenra manna fram sæ to sæ ut þurh þas þeode geweledede togædere* (271/120–272/122, 'often two or three seamen drive the troop of Christian men from sea to sea throughout this nation huddled together'). All of this, Wulfstan admonishes, is *for urum synnum* (271/113, 'because of our sins'). This inversion of the proper Christian/pagan relationship is compounded by inversions of the social hierarchy: if a slave escapes to the Danish host, he may fight against his former lord as a thegn himself, and *gif se þegen þæne þræl þe he ær ahte fullice afylle, gylde þegengylde* (271/105–6, 'if the thegn kills the slave whom he earlier owned, he pays a thegn's wergild'). But most appalling of all is the inversion most reminiscent of Antichrist, the reversal of good and evil: *menn swyþor scamað nu for goddædan þonne for misdædan . . . And þurh þæt þe man swa deð þæt man eal hyrweð þæt man scolde heregian 7 to forð laðet þæt man scolde lufian, þurh þæt man gebringede ealles to manege on yfelan gepance 7 on undæde, swa þæt hy ne scamað na þeah hy syngian swyðe 7 wið God sylfne forwyrcean hy mid ealle* (Bethurum 272/148–273/156; 'people are now more ashamed of good deeds than of evil deeds . . . And through that it happens that what should be praised is entirely derided and what should be loved is loathed too much; through that all too many are brought into evil thoughts and evil deeds, so that they are not ashamed even though they sin greatly and commit wrongs against God himself'). Ironically then, the hope that Wulfstan holds out to the suffering English lies in the Gildas passage itself: the signs detailed throughout the sermon would seem to point to the coming of Antichrist and the end of the world, yet it is still possible that the Old Testament paradigm rather than the New is at work, that through immediate and sincere repentance and atonement the English may defeat their enemies. Hollis is right that the *Sermo Lupi* is the most optimistic of Wulfstan's eschatological homilies, but the optimism

comes not in the possibility of delaying the advent of Antichrist, but rather in the hope that his time has not yet come, that there is still time for the English to transform themselves into a holy society before the final days come at last.

Finally, if Wulfstan's use of the Old Testament paradigm in EI does not represent a sea change in his thinking about the final days, but rather enables a skillful and complex balance between the two possibilities, there is no reason why he should not, after the accession of Cnut, rewrite the *Sermo Lupi* into the essentially eschatological homily found in BH by stripping out the references to the Viking attacks and restoring the Æthelred clause. It is highly unlikely that Wulfstan would have wanted to discard entirely what must have been one of his major preaching performances. That he continued 'tinkering' with portions of the text is evidenced by Napier 47 and 27.

Napier 27 is extant in C, K, and (in part) N. In C it is rubricated *To eallum folce* and in K *To eallum folke*; N contains only the final lines. It is one of several short Wulfstan homilies and fragments associated with the Pastoral Letter, although it is not part of the letter *per se*. The text is made up largely of passages taken from the *Sermo Lupi* interspersed with a few original sentences. Given its brevity – only 39 lines in Napier's edition – it would not appear to be a finished homily, although it begins with *Eala leofan men* and ends in C with the concluding formula, *Ac uton geswican georne unrihtes and wið god þingian, swa we geornost magon: he us gefilste þurh his mildheortnesse, swa his willa sy, amen* (Napier 130/7–9, 'But let us turn earnestly away from wrong and pray to God as earnestly as we can: he may help us through his mercy, as his will may be, amen'). As Wilcox has pointed out, one interest of the passage is contained in the temporal markers: the familiar sins and crimes from the *Sermo Lupi* are here designated as having been committed in the past, *ær þisum*, in what appears to be an attempt to adapt the sentences to the 'more optimistic times of Cnut's England'.⁵² The adaptation serves as a prelude to incorporation of parts of the text into one of Wulfstan's final homilies, Napier 50, and in fact the text as a whole may be an early draft of portions of that sermon.

Napier 47 is extant only in B, where it is rubricated *Larspel and Scriftboc*. As stated earlier, only the first half of the text is Wulfstan's; the second half comprises an excerpt from Byrhtferth of Ramsey's *Enchiridion* comprising an allegorical explanation of the six ages of the world followed by a listing of the eight capital sins. The first part of the text contains a number of sentences from the *Sermo Lupi*, augmented by original sentences in Wulfstan's style, most notably the analogy of the bad seed that cannot produce good fruit: *Ac soð is, þæt ic sæcge, gecnaue se ðe wylle, seldan cymð god wæstm of yfelum sæde, ne wyrð hit æfre ful god ær on þisse ðeode, ær man aweodige þa unriht and þa manweorc, þe man wide sæwð and gesawen hæfð be æghwylcum ende* (Napier 243/16–20, 'But the truth is what I say, know it who will, good fruit seldom comes from an evil seed, nor will it ever be fully good among this people until the wrongs and crimes are weeded out that were widely sown and have been sown in every corner of the earth'). Wilcox notes that Wulfstan also uses the analogy

⁵² Wilcox, 'Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi*', p. 393.

in a passage from *Her ongynd be cristendome* (Bethurum Xc; Napier 10),⁵³ in which he states that the person who turns away from sin *seal ælc unriht mid riht gebetan 7 unweod aweodian 7 god sæd aræran* (Bethurum 207/139–40, 'will atone for each wrong with right and weed out the evil weed and nourish the good seed').

The second part of Napier 47 begins with Wulfstan's customary *Leofan men* and continues with subjects familiar to readers of the eschatological homilies: the unbinding of Satan after a thousand years, the fact that the thousand years have now passed, and the idea that the world will end after six ages, just as God created the world in six days. But eschatology is immediately shunted aside as the passage from Byrhtferth continues: *Ac þæt getæl wise witan hit on oðre wisan getrahtnedon* (Napier 244/3–4, 'But the wise interpret the number in a different way'). The six days of creation, he tells us, are the days of toil on this earth, with the seventh day on which God rested signifying the resting place of the grave. This will be followed by an eighth day, the day of judgment, which is described in some detail. It is apparently the number eight that motivates Byrhtferth's sudden shift to a listing of the eight capital sins, which are tied in with the rest of the passage by the assertion that anyone who persists in these sins until the final day *seal beon cwylmiende mid deofle a butan ende, butan he hit gebete* (245/23–4, 'must be burning with the devil always without end, unless he atone'). The passage ends here, without a homiletic conclusion.

Whether Wulfstan himself made the composite text is an open question. Certainly the first part of the homily is his; Jost suggests that it may be part of a lost sermon.⁵⁴ However, Jost also believes that Wulfstan was not responsible for the composite homily on the grounds that 'Tiefsinnige mystische Textdeutungen und Berufung auf Kommentatoren liegen ihm fern'.⁵⁵ This is no doubt true, yet because the excerpt from Byrhtferth treats themes that interested Wulfstan – the final days, the last judgment, and the necessity for repentance and atonement for sins – it is possible that the archbishop considered using the passage as the basis for a homily, going so far as to compose an introduction based on sentences from the *Sermo Lupi*, but leaving the text unfinished. Were the text a finished sermon, fully revised into Wulfstan's style, it would lend weight to the idea that during the course of the Danish invasions Wulfstan's thought underwent a significant change away from a fundamentally eschatological view of the world. At the very least, the text shows that he was open to the idea of a metaphorical interpretation of the concept of sabbatical millennialism. Given the fact that he left the text unfinished, however, and given as well the evidence of Napier 50, Wulfstan was apparently unwilling to give up his eschatological expectations just yet.

In three of its manuscripts, E, I, and C, the *Sermo Lupi* is followed by a short homily (Bethurum XXI; Napier 34), rubricated in E *Her is gyt rihtlic*

⁵³ Ibid., p. 395.

⁵⁴ Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, p. 241.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 243.

warnung 7 soðlic mynung ðeode to ðearfe ('Here is yet [another] correct warning and true admonishment necessary for the nation'). The rubric in I is the same as in E, with the addition of *gyme se þe wille* ('take heed who will') in the Wulfstan hand. The text appears twice in C, under the rubrics *To eallum folce* (C1) and *Sermo Lupi* (C2). As Andy Orchard has demonstrated, the two C versions have been adapted to their manuscript contexts by a number of small changes and additions that were most likely scribal. Occurring in a wholly homiletic context, C1 is followed without a break by the opening lines of Bethurum homily XIX (Napier 28), rubricated *Be godcundre warnung* in I and G; while C2 continues past the ending of any of the other versions to include a passage taken from VIII Æthelred 36, and is followed by 'a cluster of legalistic material'.⁵⁶ The homily thus functions as a bridge between the preceding homiletic works and the following legal texts. Given the placement of the homily in its three manuscripts, Bethurum's suggestion that *gyt* refers to the *Sermo Lupi* itself⁵⁷ is probably correct; and in fact the homily borrows two lines from that text.⁵⁸ Wormald's chronology places the homily sometime before 1014;⁵⁹ however, Bethurum dates the text later in the archbishop's career, noting that 'it would be particularly apt if addressed to the northern diocese after 1016'.⁶⁰ Her assessment is based, at least in part, on the text's 'polished . . . almost poetic'⁶¹ style, characteristic of Wulfstan's later writings.

Wulfstan begins by telling his audience to do what is necessary so that *we heonanforð fadian symle ure wisan for Gode 7 for worolde wislice 7 wærlice* (Bethurum 276/4–6, 'we henceforth always order our affairs wisely and carefully in front of God and the world'). The formula *for Gode 7 for worolde* presents one of the prominent themes within the homily in its implicit contrast between the divine and the worldly, and more particularly between religious and secular authority. For although crime is punished *worldlice* . . . *swa swa man scolde* (276/8, 'in a secular way . . . as it should be'), it is nonetheless true that *hit is þe wyrse wide on earde þe man oft herede þæt man scolde hyrwan 7 to forð hyrwde þæt man scolde herian 7 laðette to swyþe þæt man scolde lufian* (276/15–277/17, 'it is the worse widely in the land in that what should be condemned is often praised and what should be praised is condemned too much and what should be loved is hated too strongly'). The necessary wisdom has been perverted into mere cunning based on lies: *Ac nu þincð þe wærra 7 mycele þe snotera se ðe can mid leasungan wæwerdlice werian 7 mid unsoðe soð oferswiðan* (277/23–5, 'But now he is thought the more cunning and much the wiser who can plausibly cover over [the truth] with lies and overcome truth with falsehood'). All

⁵⁶ Orchard, 'Editing Wulfstan', p. 316.

⁵⁷ Bethurum, p. 364.

⁵⁸ *Ac þy hit is þe wyrse wide on earde þe man oft herede þæt man scolde hyrwan 7 to forð hyrwde þæt man scolde herian 7 laðette to swyþe þæt man scolde lufian* ('But it is the worse widely in the land so that people often praise what should be condemned and thus condemn what should be praised and hate too strongly what should be loved'; Bethurum 276/15–277/18; cf. *Sermo Lupi*, Bethurum 273/153–5).

⁵⁹ Wormald, 'Eleventh-Century State-Builder', p. 26.

⁶⁰ Bethurum, p. 364.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 364.

of this is contrasted to a time in the past, *hwilum þa hit god wæs* (277/17–18, 'once when it was good'), when *hyt wæs on þeode for Gode 7 for worolde wislic 7 weorðlic, þa man riht lufode 7 unriht ascunode* (277/21–3, 'it was in the nation in front of God and the world wise and honorable, when people loved the right and shunned the wrong'). The text ends with an exhortation to love those who love God and to shun all association with those who anger God unless they cease and atone.

Although *Her is gyt rihtlic warnung* contains verbal parallels to a large number of Wulfstan's homilies; Orchard singles out Napier 50 as 'particularly noteworthy', in this regard. In one instance, *Ac wa him þæs wærscipes* (Bethurum XXI, 277/25; Napier 50, 268/19), the parallel is unique, suggesting that this homily and Napier 50 were composed at roughly the same time and thereby placing the text sometime between the composition of the *Sermo Lupi* in 1009 or 1014 and a meeting of Cnut's *witan* sometime after 1016. If *Larspell 7 Scriftboc* hints that Wulfstan was abandoning his eschatological expectations after Cnut's victory and the end of the Viking attacks, *Her is gyt rihtlic warnung* signals precisely the opposite: the themes of deception and the inversion of social values had always been associated with Antichrist in Wulfstan's mind. Although the accession of Cnut signaled a reprieve and a chance to rebuild the English nation into Wulfstan's vision of a holy society, there could have been no doubt that in the archbishop's mind the world was still in haste and there could be no guarantee that the time of Antichrist was not coming ever nearer.

Homilies Based on Legal Codes and the *Institutes of Polity*

THE HOMILIES Wulfstan composed based on his legal codes and the *Institutes of Polity* are probably the least read and commented on of all. Bethurum omitted them from her edition on the grounds of genre, and scholars interested in Wulfstan's legal writing are understandably inclined to work with full legal texts rather than homiletic adaptations. Yet the homilies are interesting in their own right, demonstrating those portions of Wulfstan's legal and political writings that he considered important enough to include in his preaching. Moreover, because these homilies were for the most part composed towards the end of the archbishop's life, they show the maturation of Wulfstan's thought on issues that had occupied him throughout his career, including the education and duties of priests (Napier 52 and 53), the proper behavior of both clergy and laity (Napier 50 and 59), the payment of tithes and other church dues (Napier 22, 23, and 61), and last but not least, the preparation of the faithful for the advent of Antichrist and the end of the world (Napier 50). These homilies make it clear that although Wulfstan did not distinguish between homily and law code in regard to content, he did in fact make some distinction in terms of genre: the homilies cite the legal codes verbatim, but they are also reshaped and adapted for oral delivery.

Napier 52 and 53, extant only in K and rubricated *To mæsseprostum* and *To mæssepreostum* respectively, together comprise a shortened and adapted version of chapter 19 of the *Institutes of Polity*; Karl Jost's parallel-text edition demonstrates that the homilies are closest to the version of *Polity* found in I and rubricated *Be sacerdan*.¹ Napier 53 follows immediately after 52 in the manuscript, and because there is no break in *Polity* at the point of the second rubric, the two are best considered as a single text. The intervening rubric may, as suggested in Chapter 2, be a correction of the misspelled rubric of 52, or it may simply be an ornamental division at a point at which a modern editor would no doubt place a paragraph break. Within the context of K, Napier 52 and 53 are part of a series of Wulfstan homilies and homiletic fragments associated with the Pastoral Letter, but they are not part of the letter itself.

Although the homilies are for the most part taken verbatim from the I version of *Polity*, a number of small variations and omissions along with an

¹ See Karl Jost, ed., *Die 'Institutes of Polity Civil and Ecclesiastical'* (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1959), pp. 84–103.

expanded conclusion indicate that the text was at least partly reshaped for use as a homily. The change in rubric from *Polity's* 'Concerning Priests' to the homily's 'To Masspriests' is the first indication that the text was rewritten for oral delivery. However, the beginning of Napier 52 is missing Wulfstan's characteristic opening *Leofan men*, starting somewhat abruptly with the first line of *Polity* 19: *Sacerd scel on his scrift[scire wislice and wærlice lædan and læran þa godcunde heorde, þe he heald scel* (Napier 275/15–16, 'A priest in his district must wisely and carefully lead and teach the spiritual flock which he must keep'). Priests are responsible for their congregations not only in this world, but also in the next: Wulfstan emphasizes that at the Last Judgment a priest must answer both for his own sins and those of his 'flock', just as a shepherd is responsible for the sheep he is entrusted to watch. The following assertion, that a priest must not hesitate to speak the truth to those with social rank and power, comprises a condensed version of *Polity's* sentence: in the homily the responsibility to speak out is also linked to the Last Judgment by the admonition that the priest who remains silent *biterlice scel hit him wyrþan forgolden on þam toweardan life* (276/1–2, 'must be bitterly repaid for it in the life to come'). The clause acts as a transition to Wulfstan's expansion of the shepherd analogy, found in both texts, in which he points out that shepherds are required to pay for lost sheep, and asks rhetorically how a priest will fare at God's terrifying judgment (*Godes egeslican dome*, 276/4) if he cannot deliver all of his spiritual sheep into the hands of Christ. The lamentations and rhetorical questions that follow, again in both texts, appear designed for oral delivery, and in fact Wulfstan is borrowing from one of Ælfric's homilies (as well as Luke 6: 39) when he asks, *Hu mæg blind man oþerne lædan, oððe hu mæg ungelæred mann oþerne læran?* (276/9–11, 'How may a blind man lead another, or how may an untaught man teach another?').² At the very least, these lines demonstrate once again the blurring of genres between Wulfstan's homiletic and political/legal writings.

The same could be said of the opening line of Napier 53, with its initial *Eala* ('Alas) introducing a new lament concerning the large number (*feala*) of men who enter the priesthood for worldly gain. The quotation from Hosea 4: 8 that follows³ is clearly adapted for oral delivery: whereas *Polity* states simply, *Be þam spæc se witega 7 þus cwæð: Ue sacerdotibus qui comedunt peccata populi et reliqua*⁴ ('About them the prophet spoke and said thus: Woe to the priests who eat the sins of the people, etc.'), Napier 53 adds that the prophet spoke *swiþe egeslice* (Napier 276/19, 'very terrifyingly'), omits *et reliqua* at the end of the quotation, and adds *þæt is on englisc* (276/20, 'that is in English') before proceeding to the translation. Wulfstan explains that priests feed on the people's sins when they receive tithes and church dues

² *Hu mæg se unlæreda lareowdom healdan, and læwedum folce fægre bodian? Be ðam cwæð se Hælend to his discipulum, 'Gif se blinda man bið oðres blindan latteow, þonne befeallað hi begen on sumum blindum seaðe. Godden, Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Second Series, 320/11.*

³ Wulfstan apparently believed that this quotation was from Ezechiel, to whom it is attributed in the Pseudo-Ecgbert penitential, III, 14. See Jost, *Institutes of Polity*, p. 98n.

⁴ Jost, *Polity*, p. 98.

but cannot or do not carry out their prescribed duties of preaching, teaching, and interceding for the people in return. *Polity* goes on to describe in detail the financial abuses carried out by priests, but the homily proceeds directly to an expanded conclusion, calling on all priests who have committed such sins to repent and atone for their misdeeds and repeating the earlier admonition that a priest who does not do so will be bitterly repaid (*bitere scel hit him wyrþan forgolden*, 277/4–5) in the life to come. The homily ends with a brief *Hali drihten gemiltsige us eallan, amen* (277/7–8, ‘May the holy Lord have mercy on us all, amen’).

The result is a more narrowly focused text than is found in *Polity*, somewhat imperfectly adapted for preaching, and probably unfinished as a homily. It is impossible to say with certainty whether or not it was Wulfstan himself who began to rewrite this portion of *Polity* for oral delivery; however, there is no evidence to suggest that he did not and much to indicate that he did. Although the parallels are not exact, Wulfstan does use the words *egeslic* and *egeslice* to describe the words of prophets in *Incipiunt sermones Lupi episcopi* and *Her ongynd be cristendom*.⁵ The ending *Halig drihten gemiltsige us ellan* occurs in Napier 36, which may not be Wulfstan’s, and in Napier 51, which certainly is. Most important, because most characteristic of Wulfstan’s other homiletic writings, is the sharpened emphasis on the necessity for repentance and atonement for sins and abuses, on the responsibility of priests for the welfare of their congregations in this world and in the next, and on the inevitability of God’s judgment and reward or punishment after death.

Dorothy Bethurum quite correctly calls Napier homily 59 ‘Wulfstan’s own summary of statements of Christian duty’.⁶ The text is extant only in Y, where it is rubricated *Sermo Lupi* and annotated in the Wulfstan hand; it dates from the final years of Wulfstan’s life. Bethurum excludes Napier 59 from her edition because it is entirely made up of sentences from the *Institutes of Polity*, I Cnut, and VI Æthelred; she comments further that ‘Repetitive as the archbishop was in some of his late sermons, he never composed a *homily* in this way’.⁷ But, as his earlier sermons make clear, this is precisely one way in which Wulfstan did compose homilies, by arranging and combining sentences and phrases from his sources to shape them into a new form, adding his distinctive homiletic openings and formulaic conclusions, and revising, expanding, or abbreviating where he felt necessary. When the source was his own writing, as it is here, he would naturally feel less need for revision, but even so he does not mechanically reproduce his legal writings verbatim in the homily.

Unlike Napier 52–3, Napier 59 has both a variant of Wulfstan’s standard homiletic opening (*Leofan men, doð, swa ic lære, gehyrað, hwæt ic wylle secgan to þearfe, gyne se ðe cunne, his agenre neode*, Napier 307/2–4, ‘Beloved people, do

⁵ *Se cwyde is swyðe egeslic þe God þurh þone witegan be þam cwæð* (‘The speech is very terrifying that God spoke about them through the prophet’), Bethurum 142/5–6; *And egeslice spæc Gregorius be ðam* (‘And Gregory spoke terrifyingly about them’), Bethurum 202/48–9.

⁶ Bethurum, p. 38.

⁷ *Ibid.*, emphasis in the original.

as I teach, listen to what I will say is necessary, take heed who can, for his own need') and of his standard conclusion (*A sy godes nama ecelice gebletsod and hym symle sy wuldor and weorðmynt æfre to worolde*, 309/8–9, 'May God's name be eternally blessed and to him always be glory and honor ever in the world'). Wulfstan begins the homily proper with a quotation from VI Æthelred that is perhaps the sentence best suited for oral delivery out of the entire law code: *Nu wyllle we læran godes þeowas georne, þæt hy sylfe wærlice beðencan and þurh godes fultum clænnesse lufian and gode ælmihtigum eadmodlice þeowian and for eall cristen folc þingian gelome* (307/8–11, 'Now we will teach God's servants earnestly that they carefully consider themselves and through God's help love purity and serve God almighty humbly and intercede often for all Christian people', VI Atr. 41). However, the next clause of VI Æthelred turns away from the subject of the clergy *per se*, and so, for his next two sentences in the homily, Wulfstan draws on the fragment rubricated *Be godes þeowum* and published by Karl Jost as Appendix A to the *Institutes of Polity*, exhorting the clergy to attend to their books and prayers, to teach and to preach, to set an example for the laity, and to live by the rule as the laity are to live by the law. These sentences conclude what Wulfstan has to say specifically about the clergy; the final words serve as a transition to the remainder of the homily, which explicitly concerns all Christians (*ealle cristene men*, 307/16) but is made up of clauses from Wulfstan's laws addressed to the laity.

The end of the homily can be divided into two sections on the basis of its sources, the first section drawing on I Cnut and the second on VI Æthelred. Wulfstan begins with I Cnut 21–2, which deals primarily with the necessity of learning the Pater Noster and the Creed, but is condensed within the homily to lay emphasis on the spiritual penalties attached to those who do not know the prayers. Ironically, therefore, the homily is less 'homiletic' than the legal code in this section: the omitted clauses (I Cnut 22.1–22.4) explain the benefits of learning the prayers and contain an abbreviated explanation of their contents. Next, lines from I Cnut 23–4 exhort the listeners to turn away from sin, particularly the sexual sins of lust, fornication, and adultery. I Cnut 25 sums up the duties of the laity before the code turns to clauses on bishops in 26; thus in the homily, Wulfstan delays inclusion of 25 in order to say more about the sexual conduct appropriate for the laity, and to do so, he turns to a different section of Cnut's code. I Cnut 7 deals with the proper degrees of consanguinity and forbids marrying nuns or more than one wife for anyone who *wyllle godes lage gyman mid rihte and wið hellebryne beorgan his sawle* (Napier 308/12–13, 'wants to follow God's law correctly and protect his soul against hellfire', I Cnut 7.3); Wulfstan omits clause 7.2, forbidding fornication, apparently because he has already included I Cnut 24. The final part of 7.3 with its injunction to protect one's soul against the fires of hell leads Wulfstan back to I Cnut 25: *7 we lærað eac georne manna gehwylcne, þæt he Godes ege hæbbe symle on his gemynde, 7 dægæs 7 nihtes forhtige for synnum, domdæg ondræde 7 for helle agrise, 7 æfre him gehende endedægæs wene* (308/13–17, 'and we also earnestly teach each person that he have the fear of God always in mind and be fearful of sin day and night, dread the day of judgment and

the terror of hell and always expect his last day to be at hand'). The second part of Wulfstan's consideration of the laity comprises VI Æthelred 42–9, a series of exhortations concerning the necessity for correct belief on the part of all Christians and injunctions on the protection of the church and the clergy, behavior on the sabbath, the payment of tithes and church dues, and the treatment of widows, orphans, the poor, and foreigners. The homily reproduces the series verbatim until the end of 49, where the final clause, *7 þæt is swyþe riht lagu* ('and that is very good law'), is omitted, apparently as inappropriate for the new homiletic form.

Although admittedly less exciting than Wulfstan's eschatological homilies or the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, Napier 59 can be seen as serving the purposes that the archbishop must have had in mind as he worked towards his vision of a holy society during the reign of Cnut. After the crisis of the Viking invasions, it was necessary to reiterate the principles of Christianity and the code of behavior expected of – and legislated for – all Christians. Certainly it would have been easier and more effective to promulgate legal requirements through the pulpit if the intended audience were the public at large, even, or perhaps especially, when those requirements were as mundane as the listings of church dues and alms considered in the next set of homilies.

Napier homilies 23 and 61 are largely concerned with the payment of tithes and church dues; in addition, the dues are listed in the portion of Wulfstan's Pastoral Letter (Bethurum XIII) that corresponds to Napier homily 22. Napier 23 is associated with the Letter in three manuscripts (B, C, and K); however, as pointed out in Chapter 5, it is part of the Letter itself only in B, where it disrupts the flow of the sermon by repeating and adding to the material concerning church dues that had been presented earlier in 22. If it had originally been part of the Letter, the text was excised later versions. In C, Napier 23 is rubricated *To Eallum Folce* and occurs at the end of the Letter as a separate homily; in K, where the text is part of a collection of fragments of the Letter and short homiletic pieces, the rubric is spelled *To Eallum Folke*. Napier homily 61 is extant only in Y under the rubric *Be cristendome*, where it forms a companion piece to Napier 60, *Be hæpendome*.

The task of getting people to pay tithes and church dues regularly and on time could never have been easy; it was compounded in late Anglo-Saxon England by the variety of dues to be paid and the lack of systemization in the process. The dues had grown up piecemeal over the course of the Christian centuries, and even those who sincerely wished to pay what they owed must have been confused at times with regard to the types and times of the payments. In addition, at a time when the number of churches was increasing rapidly, the question of who was to receive the payments – the local church or the older minster – posed another problem for clergy and laity alike. Thus Wulfstan's homiletic enumerations of the various dues and the dates on which they were to be paid are not only reminders to the faithful; rather, they also constitute an attempt to regularize and systematize the traditional practices. Wulfstan's homilies and laws prescribe six kinds of yearly offerings to the church at specified times: tithes on both livestock and agriculture;

Romfeoh or *Rompenegas*, sometimes called *heorðpenegas* ('hearth-pennies') and only later called 'Peter's Pence'; churchscot, a render paid annually in grain; lightscot, candles or oil for lighting church lamps; plough-alms, assessed at a penny per plough; and soulscot, a payment in return for burial in a church graveyard. Not mentioned by Wulfstan, but included in a Wiltshire lease of 902, is churchbot, the obligation to maintain the church building.⁸

It is possible that some of these dues – or at least the mandatory payment of them – are Wulfstan's innovations. Dorothy Whitelock pointed out in 1941 that lightscot is absent from detailed listings of church dues in I Æthelstan, I Edmund, and II Edgar, but appears in Wulfstan's legislation as well as his homilies.⁹ More recently, Patrick Wormald has suggested that compulsory payment of not only lightscot, but also soulscot and 'probably' plough-alms is an innovation as well,¹⁰ pointing out that where these appear in earlier codes, such as I Edmund, they are accompanied by the Wulfstanian *georne* (in I) and *þe geornor* (in C).¹¹ The further injunction that soulscot is best paid *æt openum græfe* ('at the open grave') may be less 'a vivid glimpse of entrenched social ritual'¹² than an attempt to ensure that the payment would be rendered to the church providing the service.

Tithes, the only payment with a clear biblical mandate, seem to have become mandatory in England only at the time of the tenth-century reform. It is mostly likely for this reason that Wulfstan finds it necessary to define and explain the payment in his homilies, whereas the traditional church dues are generally left undefined. Napier 22 does not contain the word 'tithe' (*teopung*), but instead explains the payment as *se teoða dæl ealra þæra ðinga þe he us on ðysum lænan life to forlæten hæfð* (Napier 113/4–5, 'the tenth part of all those things that [God] has allowed us in this transitory life'); in addition, Wulfstan hints at a misperception that tithes were meant to replace the more traditional payments when he continues that *Donne is þærtoeacan gyt to understandenne þæt we eac eadmodlice eal gelæstan on geargerihtan þæt ure ylðran hwilum ær gode behetan. Ðæt is sulhælmessan 7 rompenegas 7 cyricsceattas 7 leohtgescota* (113/8–11, 'Then it is still necessary for each to understand that we also humbly carry out all the yearly dues that our elders once before promised to God. That is plow-alms and Rome-pennies and churchscot and lightscot'). Napier 23 divides the tithe into two payments: one on *geoguðe* (116/2), the young animals born during the year, to be paid by Pentecost, and a second on *eorðwæstmā* (116/3, 'fruits of the earth') to be paid on All Saints day. Napier 61 elaborates even further (Napier 310/21–311/1):

And þæt is an ærest, þæt man geteoðige æghwylce geara þæt, þæt god sende þonne on geara folce to pearfe on corne and on flexe and on gewelhwylcon wæstmē. And arise seo æcerteoðung a, be ðam þe seo sulh þone teoðan æcer ær

⁸ Blair, *Church*, p. 437.

⁹ Dorothy Whitelock, 'Wulfstan and the So-Called Laws of Edward and Guthrum', *English Historical Review* 56 (1941), 1–21, at p. 9.

¹⁰ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, p. 342, 342n.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 309, 309n.

¹² Blair, *Church*, p. 439.

geeode, be godes miltse and be ðæs cynges and be ealles cristenes folces and be ðære steore, þe Eadgar cyng gelagode. And sy ælcere geogode teoðung gelæst be pentecosten be wite and eorðwæstma be ealra halgena mæssan.

And that is first, that which God sent during the year for the needs of the people in grain and in flax and in every kind of fruit is tithed each year. And the acre-tithing always comes on the tenth acre the plough went over before, according to God's mercy and according to that of the king and according to all Christian people and according to the regulations that King Edgar laid down. And the tithe on all young animals is to be paid at Pentecost in money or food and that on the fruits of the earth by the mass of All Saints.

The same pattern of progressive elaboration holds true for the traditional church dues: whereas Napier 22 merely lists the dues to be paid in addition to tithes, Napier 23 adds the dates on which they are to be rendered: ploughscot fifteen days after Easter; tithes on animals by Pentecost and on crops by All Saints' day; *Romfeoh* on Saint Peter's feast day (to be paid to *ðam biscopstole*, 116/5, 'at the bishop's seat'); churchscot by Saint Martin's day; and lightscot three times during the year, at Candlemas, Easter, and All Saints'. Napier 61 adds penalties for neglecting payments: 300 pennies sent to Rome and 120 shillings to the king for failure to pay *Romfeoh*, and a twelve-fold fine and 120 shillings to the king for failure to pay churchscot. The standardization of these fines probably developed after the composition of Napier 23, for the fines are listed in Wulfstan's 1014 code (VIII Æthelred) but not in the corresponding section of VI Æthelred (1008). If so, it may explain why Wulfstan felt it necessary to compose an additional homiletic tract devoted entirely to a full explanation of church dues.

Napier homilies 50 and 51 are addressed to the king's *witan*; both were excluded from Bethurum's edition on the grounds of genre. Of the two, Napier 51, extant only in K and rubricated *To eallum folke*, is perhaps the less homiletic in the strictest sense; Karl Jost has argued that it should be considered an opening statement of the *witan*'s legal deliberations rather than a homily.¹³ It is also most likely the earlier of the two texts, as it draws for the most part on Æthelred's codes rather than Cnut's. Jost suggests that it may date from the 1008 meeting of the *witan* at Enham;¹⁴ Wormald suggests 1014, but adds the caveat that 'the sermon could have been preached to whichever council at whatever time issued an entirely separate IX [Æthelred] (or X, or indeed a code of which no other trace remains)'.¹⁵

Wulfstan opens the homily with instructions to the *witan*, addressed as *Leofan men*, to enact good secular legislation (*lagiað gode woroldlagan*, Napier 274/7) that will also ensure that Christianity is observed correctly, that the kingdom is upheld, and that peace among all people is maintained *betere þonne hit git sig* (274/10, 'better than it is now'). He himself, Wulfstan announces, will begin the process, which he does by restating the golden rule. He continues with a listing of laws that must be obeyed; characteristically, these are both

¹³ Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, pp. 105–6.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

¹⁵ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, p. 337n.

religious and secular, and all are paralleled, although not always verbatim, in Æthelred's codes: Bethurum points out the resemblances to V Æthelred 1–1.2 and 35;¹⁶ to these may be added parallels to VIII Æthelred 44 and to the fragmentary IX and X Æthelred. Most interesting of all is probably Wulfstan's statement that *Open þyfd̥e and hlaforðes searwu and abære morð æfter woruldlagu is botleas þing* (274/23–4, 'Open theft and treason and public murder cannot be atoned for according to the secular law'); that is, such acts cannot be amended through monetary payment; they are 'bootless' crimes. Bethurum cites II Cnut 64 as a parallel, and Wormald confirms that there are no earlier references in the law codes to 'bootless' crimes.¹⁷ The sentence in the homily is not, however, a verbatim borrowing from II Cnut, which includes *husbryce ȝ bærn̥et* ('house-breaking and burning') among the bootless crimes and lists the remainder as *open þyfd̥ ȝ æbære morð ȝ hlaforðswyce* ('open theft and public murder and treason'). Rather than dating the homily from Cnut's reign or supposing an interpolation, Wormald is probably right to suggest that VIII Æthelred, which is primarily an ecclesiastical code, at one time had a secular counterpart corresponding to II Cnut that included the bootless crimes; this would give the homily a date of c.1014, when VIII Æthelred was issued.

Unparalleled in any of Wulfstan's writings, but apparently offered here in contrast to the bootless nature of the crimes in secular law, is the hierarchical series of ecclesiastical figures to whom a sinner can go for spiritual absolution: first the confessor, then the diocesan bishop, then the archbishop, and finally the pope. If all are unavailing, the highest judge of all is God himself. With a final reminder from the *Institutes of Polity* to keep the peace of the church and of the king,¹⁸ Wulfstan ends his comments to the *witan* by instructing them to deliberate further.

If Napier 51 comprises opening remarks to a legislative session of the *witan*, Napier homily 50 is a complete sermon delivered to the same body combining Wulfstan's political and legal ideas with a restatement of themes from the earlier eschatological homilies and the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. Karl Jost's meticulous cataloguing of the sources and analogues to the text remains invaluable despite the fact that, as noted in Chapter 3, Jost was unconvinced of Wulfstan's authorship of Cnut's laws and therefore believed the text to be the work of a compiler who combined single words and phrases from as many as twenty different Wulfstan texts: 'Entnimmt er in 272,20 dem einen Text das Subjekt, einem andern das Prädikat und einem dritten ein weiteres Prädikat mit seinem Objekt; in 272,15 ersetzt er das Verb seiner Hauptvorlage durch dasjenige eines ähnlichen Textes, und in 272,3, bedient er sich einer weiteren Stelle derselben Vorlage, um den swei Objekten seines Satzes je ein passendes adjektivisches Attribut beugeben zu können.'¹⁹ Such a procedure

¹⁶ Bethurum, p. 37.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 37; Wormald, *Making of English Law*, p. 337n.

¹⁸ Jost, *Polity*, ch. 35, *Be cirican*, p. 240.

¹⁹ 'In 272.20 he takes a subject from one text, the predicate from another, and from a third a second predicate with its own object; in 272.15 he puts the verb of his main source into similar texts, and in 272.3 he gives a second passage from the same predecessor, to be able to attach

would probably have been necessary for anyone except Wulfstan himself in the composition of the sermon; however, a Wulfstan imitator or homiletic compiler would have been unlikely to attempt it. Rather, as Bethurum points out, in those sentences the archbishop was most likely quoting himself from memory instead of consciously interweaving earlier texts.²⁰ Even so, the most important of Jost's source-attributions still stand: among them are the *Institutes of Polity*, VI Æthelred, I Cnut, Ælfric's Old English letters to Wulfstan, the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, and three of Wulfstan's eschatological homilies.

The homily is extant only in A, where it occurs as one of three additional sections of the manuscript that Ker identified as having been written at Exeter.²¹ The text is rubricated *Lar Spell* and is immediately followed by Wulfstan's *Secundum Lucam*. Both texts are written in the same 'Exeter'-style script in a hand that occurs nowhere else in the manuscript. Napier 50 begins at the top of the first page of a new quire; *Secundum Lucam* concludes at the end of the next quire, followed only by two blank pages. Thus, the quires containing the two homilies make up an independent unit within the manuscript as a whole, a conclusion strengthened by the fact that although they are currently bound as quires 15–16, that is, pages 209–26 of the manuscript, offset writing on page 98 – a blank page at the end of what is currently quire 7 – reveals that the two quires were at one time adjacent to that page and at that time followed another Exeter addition to the manuscript in a different hand.²²

Napier 50 and *Secundum Lucam* are separated on page 221 of the manuscript by a single blank line that shows signs of erasure, making it difficult to tell whether the scribe intended the texts to be read as one homily or two. Napier 50 does end with a conventional closing formula: *On godes naman we biddað þæt cristenra manna gehwīlc . . . gemanan habban mote on hefena rice þær is ece blis. 7 æfre bið. mid þam þe leofað. 7 rixað. a butan ende. Amen* (Napier 273/32–274/5, 'In God's name we ask . . . that each Christian remember that in heaven there is and always will be eternal bliss with the one who lives and rules, world without end, amen'); however, the beginning of *Secundum Lucam* has been emended in such a way that it can easily be seen as a continuation of the previous homily. The text is missing both its rubric, found only in E, and the Latin quotation from Luke 21 (*Erunt signa in sole & luna & stellis. & reliqua*; Bethurum 123/3, 'There will be signs in the sun and moon and stars, etc.') that begins the homily in both E and C. In those manuscripts the quotation is followed immediately by an opening to the Old English text that refers directly to the full passage from Luke: *Dis godspel segð 7 swutelað þæt fela fortacna sculon geweorðan wide on worulde, ægðer ge on heofonlicum tunglum ge on eorðlicum styrungum, ær ðam þe se dom cume þe us eallum wyrð gemæne* (Bethurum 123/4–7, 'This gospel says and makes clear that many portents

an attributive adjective to the two objects of his sentence', Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, p. 259. Jost's numbers refer to page and line of the Napier text.

²⁰ Bethurum, p. 39. As a source for this point, Bethurum cites the first edition of Whitelock's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, p. 25; see p. 37 in the 3rd edition.

²¹ Ker, item 69, p. 118.

²² Ker, item 68, p. 117. Ker attributes the observation to Enid Raynes.

must occur widely in the world, both in the heavenly stars and in earthly movements, before the judgment comes that is common to us all'). In contrast, the A scribe has adapted his text to accommodate the missing rubric and quotation by replacing the original opening phrase with wording that does not presuppose a prior quotation: *Crist cwæð on his halgan godspelle. þæt fela fortacna sculon geweorðan wide on worulde . . .* ('Christ said in his holy gospel that many portents must occur widely in the world . . .'). The adaptation suggests that the scribe intended Napier 50 and *Secundum Lucam* to be read together, despite the conventional closing formula at the conclusion of Napier 50. When read as two parts of a single work, the merging of the two homilies makes the text into a largely eschatological sermon. Moreover, Archbishop Parker's table of contents for the manuscript does not list *Secundum Lucam* as a separate work; perhaps, given the missing rubric and the eschatological content of the final paragraphs of Napier 50, Parker also considered the two to be a single homily. The most important point is that the manuscript context of Napier 50 places the sermon in a firmly eschatological setting, indicating that for at least one reader in Anglo-Saxon England, the eschatological ending of the sermon was not perceived as a merely conventional homiletic conclusion, but rather as an important part of the text as a whole.

Bethurum dates Napier 50 to sometime after 1020 on the basis of its quotations from I Cnut.²³ Wormald places it two to three years earlier, regarding the sermon as associated in some way with Cnut's 1018 Oxford code and as a possible source-text for I Cnut.²⁴ Such an association raises the possibility that the sermon was intended to be preached in Oxford at the 1018 meeting, perhaps, like Napier 51, as a preliminary announcement of the laws that Wulfstan wanted to be enacted. It is certainly addressed to an aristocratic audience made up of both secular and religious figures, one of whom was explicitly the king himself. The sermon begins with an address to *urum cynehlaforð* (Napier 266/2, 'our lord the king') and proceeds in turn to address the secular nobility, then judges and reeves, and finally the clergy, taking up the rights, duties, and possible failings of each, and paying particular attention to the problem of non-celibate priests. After a short glance at the necessity for just weights and measures and the proper observance of feasts and (especially) fasts, the homily ends with an exhortation for all to remember that the age of Antichrist is coming, and for the clergy to prepare the faithful for the inevitable last day.

A second reason for the late dating of the homily lies in Wulfstan's repeated references to the evil times that occurred before the writing of the sermon, indicating that the text was compiled after Cnut was established as king and the land was at peace. The words *ær þysan* and *ær þysum* echo throughout the text from beginning to end. Wulfstan states, for example, that the church must be honored and protected better than it was 'before this'; that judges and reeves should help the clergy more than was done 'before this'; that the

²³ Bethurum, p. 40.

²⁴ Wormald, *Making of English Law*, pp. 355–60.

witan must take care that the devil does not lead them astray or divide them, as he has done ‘before this’; and that the clergy themselves must uphold God’s law better than was done ‘before this’. Wulfstan’s concern with the status and treatment of the church and clergy is obvious in the examples given, as is his corresponding concern that the clergy live up to the treatment he feels they should be accorded. Overall, however, the homily appears to be a warning that peace brings responsibilities with it, and that if God’s law and the political principles that govern a just, Christian society are not acted upon by both laymen and clerics in times of peace, the nation can expect even more calamities to follow.

In her discussion of the sermon, Bethurum states somewhat dismissively that Wulfstan ‘can rise to an impassioned reminder of the Last Judgment at the end of any homily, no matter how pedagogical its content’,²⁵ but in fact Wulfstan prepares for the eschatological ending of Napier 50 throughout his text. Explicit reminders of the final days occur in the early part of the homily twice: the first is in a sentence for which Jost could discover no immediate source and that was therefore most likely composed for this sermon, in which Wulfstan warns the lay aristocracy to atone for their sins so that they may *on þam myclan dæge heom sylfum gebeorgan bet, þonne þa dydon, þe beforan wæron* (Napier 268/10–11, ‘protect themselves better on that great day, than did those who came before them’). The second comes in a quotation from the *Institutes of Polity*, in which Wulfstan asks those priests who are not celibate to remember what reward they can expect from God (*hwylces leanes hig him wenan magon*, 270/25–6), and assures them that it will be an evil one (*hig yfel lean habban scylan*, 270/27) unless they change their ways. With these references one can perhaps put another quotation from VI Æthelred – a plea for the clergy as a whole to protect themselves from the surging fires of hell (*þone weallendan bryne, þe wealleð on helle*, 269/19–20).

Not explicitly eschatological, but no less thoroughly collocated with the Last Judgment and its herald Antichrist in Wulfstan’s mind and sermons, are two of the major themes of Napier 50: the dangers to the individual soul and to the society at large of both the sins of the flesh and those of deception, lies, and hypocrisy. Wulfstan introduces the theme of deceit in the section of the homily addressed to judges and reeves by asserting that *ær þysan wæs gehwar swicdom swyðra þonne wisdom. 7 þuhte hwilcum wisast se þe wæs swicolost. 7 se þe lytelicost cuðe leaslice hiwian unsod to soðe* (Napier 268/15–18, ‘before this, there was everywhere more deceit than wisdom, and at that time he was thought wisest who was most deceitful and knew most cunningly how to pretend falsely that lies were truth’). The homily’s relentless repetition of ‘before this’ gives striking rhetorical emphasis to Wulfstan’s sudden switch, two sentences later, from what *was* to what *still is*: *Forþam on þison earde wæs and git is . . . unrihta fela . . . Fela syn forsworene and swyðe forlogone and wedd eac abrocene oft and gelome* (268/24–8, ‘Because in this land there were and still are . . . many wrongs . . . Many are forsworn and greatly perjured and also

²⁵ Bethurum, p. 40.

oaths are broken time and again'). The implication of these sentences – that by continuing to commit the sins that Wulfstan believed brought on the Danish invasions, the English are once again courting divine punishment – is strengthened by the fact that they are cited directly from the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, and would probably have had an even greater impact on those who recognized the allusion. The same sort of caution recurs later in Napier 50, where Wulfstan warns that even now the *deofol dwelað manna gepohtas* (272/31–273/1, 'the devil hinders men's thoughts'), so that they no longer think about the coming age of Antichrist.

The theme of clerical celibacy and of chastity in general is treated in the section of the sermon addressed particularly to God's servants, including bishops, abbots, monks, priests, and nuns (*godes þeowas, biscopas 7 abbodas, munecas 7 mynecena, preostas 7 nunnan*, 269/1–2). Wulfstan chastises priests not only for marrying, but also, as he tells us, for what *is þe wyrse, þe sume habbað twa oððe ma, 7 sume forlætað, þa hig ær hæfdon, 7 be lifiendre cwenan eft oðre nimað, swa ænigum cristenum men ne gedafenað to donne* (Napier 269/21–4, 'is even worse, that certain ones have two or more [wives], and some leave behind the one they had before, and while the woman is still living take another, as is not right for any Christian man to do'). In addition, he sets out the degree of consanguinity permissible in marriage, forbids the marriage of nuns, and reminds the laity that a man may marry only one wife, with whom he must remain *þa hwile, þe heo lybbe* (271/15, 'while she is alive'). Although such statements are clearly not eschatological, violations of chastity – along with lies and hypocrisy – are sins particularly associated in Wulfstan's earlier homilies with Antichrist and his advent, and as discussed in Chapter 4, it is with Antichrist that Wulfstan concludes Napier 50.

It seems clear that in spite of his advancing years and the weariness they appear to have brought on, Wulfstan remained convinced that the world he lived in was still in haste and nearing its end. He had spent a lifetime teaching his flock how to behave as a 'Holy Society' that would be capable of meeting any danger with steadfast faith strengthened by communal acts of worship and penance – whether that danger came from invading armies or Antichrist himself. He instructed them in the basics of their faith, explained their sacraments and how to remain true to the promises they had made to God; he admonished them when they failed, urged them to repent and be forgiven, and exhorted them endlessly to become the conscious Christian community he envisaged. In Napier 50, perhaps his final homily, he returned to the writing of his early years to give a last warning to the *witan* about the Last Days that would inevitably arrive, coming full circle from the beginning of his career a quarter of a century earlier.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Abbo, *Abbo von Saint-Germain-des-Prés: 22 Predigten*, ed. Ute Önnerrfors (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1985)
- Adso Dervensis, *De ortu et tempore Antichristi necnon et tractatus qui ab eo dependunt*, ed. D. Verhelst, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis* 45 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976)
- Ælfric, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series*, ed. Peter Clemoes, EETS ss 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series*, ed. Malcolm Godden, EETS ss 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979)
- *Ælfric's Letter to the Monks of Eynsham*, ed. Christopher A. Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- *Ælfric's Prefaces*, ed. Jonathan Wilcox, *Durham Medieval Texts* (Durham: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1995; corr. repr. 1996)
- *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics in altenglischer und lateinischer Fassung*, ed. Bernhard Fehr, *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa* 9 (Hamburg, 1914; repr. with a supplement to the introduction by Peter Clemoes, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966)
- *The Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, ed. John C. Pope, 2 vols., EETS os 259–60 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967–8)
- Alcuin, *Two Alcuin Letter Books*, ed. Colin Chase, *Toronto Medieval Latin Texts* 5 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975)
- Augustine, *De civitate Dei. Libri XI–XXII*, ed. Bernhard Domhart and Alphonsus Kalb (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955)
- Barker, Nicholas, ed., *The York Gospels: A Facsimile with Introductory Essays* (London: Roxburghe Club, 1987)
- Bazire, J., and J. E. Cross, eds., *Eleven Old English Rogationtide Homilies* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982)
- Bede, *Venerabilis Baedae opera historica*, ed. Charles Plummer, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886; repr. 1957)
- *Bedaee opera de temporibus*, ed. Christopher Williams Jones (Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1943)
- Bethurum: see Wulfstan
- Blake, E. O., ed., *Liber Eliensis* (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1962)
- Byrhtferth, *Byrhtferth's Enchiridion*, ed. Peter S. Baker and Michael Lapidge, EETS os 15 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)
- Caie, Graham D., ed. and trans., *The Old English Poem 'Judgment Day II': A Critical Edition with Editions of 'De dii iudicii' and the Hatton 113 Homily 'Be domes dæge'* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000)
- Charles, R. H., ed., *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908)

- Cross, James E., and J. Morrish Tunberg, eds., *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection: Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek Gl. Kgl. Sam. 1595, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 25* (Copenhagen: Roskilde and Bagger, 1993)
- Egils saga Skalla-Grimsson*, ed. Sigurður Nordal, Íslenzk fornrit 2 (Reykjavík: Hið íslenzka fornritafélag, 1933)
- Fowler, Roger, ed., 'A Late Old English Handbook for the Use of a Confessor', *Anglia* 83 (1965), 1–34
- Haddon, Arthur West, and William Stubbs, eds., *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869–78)
- Hemming, *Chartularium ecclesiae Wigoriensis*, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1723)
- Ker, N. R., ed., *The Pastoral Care, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 6* (Copenhagen: Roskilde and Bagger, 1956)
- Keynes, Simon, and David Dumville, gen. eds., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1983–)
- Liebermann, Fritz, ed., *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 3 vols (Halle: Niemeyer, 1903–16)
- *Quadripartitus: Ein englisches Rechtsbuch von 1114* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1892)
- Lipsius, Richard, and Maximillian Bonnet, eds., 'Passio sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli'. *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* (Leipzig: Hermann Mendelsohn, 1901)
- Loyn, H. R., ed., *A Wulfstan Manuscript Containing Institutes, Laws and Homilies: British Museum Cotton Nero A.i*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 17 (Copenhagen: Roskilde and Bagger, 1971)
- Morris, R., ed. and trans., *The Blickling Homilies*, EETS os 58, 63, 73 (London, 1874–80, repr. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967)
- Napier: see Wulfstan
- Plummer, Charles, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel, with Supplementary Extracts from the Others*. 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892–9)
- Raith, Josef, ed., *Die altenglische version des Halitgar'schen Bussbuches* (Hamburg: H. Grand, 1933)
- Scragg, D. G., ed., *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, EETS os 300 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992)
- Stubbs, William, ed., *Memorials of St. Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury*, Rolls Series 63 (London: Longman, 1874)
- Thorpe, Benjamin, trans., *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England* (London: Eyre and Spottiswood, 1840)
- Turner, D. H., ed., *The Claudius Pontificals*, Henry Bradshaw Society 97 (London: Chichester, Moore, and Tillyer, 1971)
- Víga-Glúms saga*, in *Eyfirðinga sögur*, ed. Jónas Kristjánsson, Íslenzk fornrit 9 (Reykjavík: Hið íslenzka fornritafélag, 1956)
- William of Malmesbury, *De antiquitate Glastonie ecclesie*, ed. J. Scott (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 1981)
- *De gestis pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, Rolls Series 52 (London: Longman, 1870)
- Wulfstan, *The Homilies of Wulfstan*, ed. Dorothy Bethurum (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957; repr. 1998)
- *Die 'Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical': Ein Werk erzbischof Wulfstans von York*, ed. Karl Jost, Swiss Studies in English 47 (Bern: Francke, 1959)
- *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, ed. Dorothy Whitelock (3rd edn, London: Methuen, 1963)
- *Wulfstan's Canon Law Collection*, ed. James E. Cross and Andrew Hamer (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1999)

- Wulfstan, *Wulfstan's Canons of Edgar*, ed. Roger Fowler, EETS 266 (London: Early English Text Society, 1972)
- *Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit*, ed. Arthur Napier (Berlin: Weidmann, 1883)

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abrams, Lesley, 'The Conversion of the Danelaw', in *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress, Nottingham and York, 21–30 August 1997*, ed. James Graham-Campbell, Richard Hall, Judith Jesch, and David N. Parsons (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001), pp. 31–44
- Atkinson, Nancy E., and Dan E. Burton, 'Harrowing the Houses of the Holy: Images of Violation in Wulfstan's Homilies', in *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium*, ed. Michael Frassetto (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), pp. 49–62
- Barlow, Frank, *The English Church 1000–1066* (2nd edn, London and New York: Longman, 1979)
- Bateson, Mary, 'A Worcester Cathedral Book of Ecclesiastical Collections, Made c.1000 A.D.', *English Historical Review* 10 (1895), 712–31
- Baxter, Stephen, 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Administration of God's Property', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 161–205
- Becher, Richard, *Wulfstans Homilien* (Leipzig: Sturm Verlag, 1910)
- Bedingfield, Bradford M., *The Dramatic Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2002)
- 'Public Penance in Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglo-Saxon England* 31 (2002), 223–55
- Bethurum, Dorothy, 'A Letter of Protest from the English Bishops to the Pope', in *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies*, ed. Thomas A. Kirby and Henry Bosley Woolf (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1949), pp. 97–104
- 'Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book', *PMLA* 57 (1942), 916–29
- 'Episcopal Magnificence in the Eleventh Century', in *Studies in Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur*, ed. Stanley B. Greenfield (Eugene: University of Oregon Press, 1963), pp. 162–70
- 'Stylistic Features of the Old English Laws', *Modern Language Review* 27 (1932), 263–79
- 'Six Anonymous Old English Codes', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 49 (1950), 449–63
- 'Wulfstan', in *Continuations and Beginnings: Studies in Old English Literature*, ed. E. G. Stanley (London: Nelson, 1966), pp. 210–46
- Bethurum Loomis, Dorothy, 'Regnum and Sacerdotum in the Early Eleventh Century', in *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. Peter Clemoes and Kathleen Hughes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 134–7, 142–3
- Blair, John, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
- 'Debate: Ecclesiastical Organization and Pastoral Care in Anglo-Saxon England', *Early Medieval Europe* 4 (1995), 193–212
- 'Introduction: From Minster to Parish Church', in *Minsters and Parish Churches: The Local Church in Transition 950–1200*, ed. John Blair (Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, 1988), pp. 1–19

- Bloomfield, Morton W., *The Seven Deadly Sins: An Introduction to the History of a Religious Concept, with Special Reference to Medieval English Literature* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1952, repr. 1967)
- Brown, Alan, and J. E. Cross, 'The Literary Impetus for Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi*', *Leeds Studies in English* 20 (1989), 270–91
- Budny, Mildred, *Insular, Anglo-Saxon, and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge: An Illustrated Catalogue*, 2 vols. (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1997)
- Bullough, D. A., 'The Continental Background of the Reform', in *Tenth Century Studies: Essays in Commemoration of the Millennium of the Council of Winchester and Regularis Concordia*, ed. David Parsons (London: Phillimore, 1975)
- Cameron, Angus, 'A List of Old English Texts', in *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*, ed. Roberta Frank and Angus Cameron (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), pp. 25–306
- Chapman, Don, 'Germanic Tradition and Latin Learning in Wulfstan's Echoic Compounds', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 101 (2002), 1–18
- Clemoes, Peter, 'Ælfric's Catholic Homilies, First Series: The Text and Manuscript Tradition' (Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge University, 1956)
- 'The Chronology of Ælfric's Works', in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of their History and Culture Presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. P. A. M. Clemoes. (London: Bowes & Bowes, 1959), pp. 212–47 (repr. in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach. New York: Garland, 2000, pp. 29–72)
- 'The Old English Benedictine Office, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 190, and the Relations between Ælfric and Wulfstan: A Reconsideration', *Anglia* 78 (1960), 265–83
- Cramer, Peter, *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, c.200–c.1150* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)
- Crook, John, 'Vir optimus Wlstanis': The Post-Conquest Commemoration of Archbishop Wulfstan of York at Ely Cathedral', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 501–24
- Cross, J. E., 'Aspects of Microcosm and Macrocosm in Old English Literature', in *Studies in English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur*, ed. Stanley B. Greenfield (Eugene: University of Oregon Press, 1963), pp. 1–22
- 'Atto of Vercelli, *De Pressuris Ecclesiasticis*, Archbishop Wulfstan, and Wulfstan's Commonplace Book', *Traditio* 48 (1993), 237–46
- 'Contents of the Manuscript', in *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection: Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek Gl. Kgl. Sam. 1595*, ed. James E. Cross and Jennifer Morrish Tunberg, *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile* 25 (Copenhagen: Roskilde and Bagger, 1993), pp. 14–23
- 'Wulfstan's *Incipit de Baptismo* (Bethurum XIII A): A Revision of Sources', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 90 (1989), 237–42
- 'Wulfstan's *De Anticristo* in a Twelfth-Century Worcester Manuscript', *Anglo-Saxon England* 20 (1991), 203–20
- and Alan Brown, 'Wulfstan and Abbo at Saint-Germain-des-Près', *Mediaevalia* 15 (1993 for 1989), 71–91
- 'A Newly Identified Manuscript of Wulfstan's "Commonplace Book"', Rouen Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 1382 (U. 109), fols. 173r–198v, *Journal of Medieval Latin* 2 (1992), 63–83
- and Andrew Hamer, 'Source-Identification and Manuscript Recovery: The British Library Wulfstan MS. Cotton Nero A.i., 131v–132v', *Scriptorium* 50 (1996), 132–7

Bibliography

- Cubitt, Catherine, *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils, c.650–c.850* (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1995)
- Dagenais, John, *The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture: Glossing the 'Libro de Buen Amor'* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994)
- Dien, Stephanie, 'Sermo Lupi ad Anglos: The Order and Date of the Three Versions', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 76 (1975), 561–70
- DiNapoli, Robert, *An Index of Theme and Image to the Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (Frithgarth: Anglo-Saxon Books, 1995)
- Dorn, Erhard, *Der sündige Heilige in der Legende des Mittelalters*, *Medium Aevum: Philologische Studien* 10 (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1967)
- Dumville, D. N., 'Anglo-Saxon Books: Treasure in Norman Hands?', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 16 (1994), 83–99
- *English Caroline Script and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism, A.D. 950–1030* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1993)
- *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History of Late Anglo-Saxon England*, *Studies in Anglo-Saxon History* 5 (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1992)
- Duncan, Edwin, 'Fears of the Apocalypse: The Anglo-Saxons and the Coming of the First Millennium', *Religion and Literature* 31 (1999), 15–23
- Emmerson, Richard Kenneth, *Antichrist in the Middle Ages: A Study of Medieval Apocalypticism, Art and Literature* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981)
- 'Antichrist as Anti-Saint: The Significance of Abbot Adso's *Libellus de Antichristo*', *American Benedictine Review* 30 (1979), 175–90
- 'From *Libellus* to *Sermo*: The Old English Version of Adso's *Libellus de Antichristo*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 82 (1983), 1–10
- and Bernard McGinn, eds., *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992)
- Feiler, Emil, 'Das Benediktiner-Offizium', *Anglistische Forschungen* 4 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1901)
- Ferreiro, Albert, 'Simon Magus: The Patristic-Medieval Traditions and Historiography', *Apocrypha* 7 (1996), 147–65
- Fisher, J. D. C., *Christian Initiation: Baptism in the Medieval West*, *Alcuin Club Collections* 47 (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1965)
- Fowler, R. G., 'Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book and the *Canons of Edgar*', *Medium Aevum* 32 (1963), 1–10
- 'Some Stylistic Features of the *Sermo Lupi*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 65 (1966), 14–17
- Frantzen, Allen J., *The Literature of Penance in Anglo-Saxon England* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1983)
- Frassetto, Michael, ed., *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002)
- Gatch, Milton McC., *Eschatology and Christian Nurture: Themes in Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Religious Life* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000)
- *Preaching and Theology in Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric and Wulfstan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977)
- 'The Unknowable Audience of the Blickling Homilies', *Anglo-Saxon England* 18 (1989), 99–115
- Gem, Richard, 'A Recession in Early English Architecture during the Early Eleventh Century, and its Effect on the Development of the Romanesque Style', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 38 (1975), 28–49

- Gerritsen, John, 'The Copenhagen Wulfstan Manuscript: A Codicological Study', *English Studies* 79 (1998), 501–11
- Gittos, Helen, and M. Bradford Bedingfield, eds., *The Liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (London: Henry Bradshaw Society, 2005)
- Gneuss, Helmut. *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England Up to 1100* (Tempe, AZ: Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2001)
- 'The Origin and Provenance of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: The Case of Cotton Tiberius A.III', in *Of the Making of Books: Essays Presented to M. B. Parkes*, ed. P. R. Robinson and Rivkah Zim (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1997), pp. 13–48
- Godden, Malcolm R., 'Apocalypse and Invasion in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *From Anglo-Saxon to Early Middle English: Studies Presented to E. G. Stanley*, ed. Malcolm Godden, Douglas Gray, and Terry Hoad (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 130–62
- 'Old English Composite Homilies from Winchester', *Anglo-Saxon England* 4 (1975), 57–65
- 'The Millennium, Time and History for the Anglo-Saxons', in *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950–1050*, ed. Richard Landes, Andrew Gow, and David C. van Meter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 155–80
- 'The Relations of Wulfstan and Ælfric: A Reassessment', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 353–74
- Green, Eugene, 'On Syntactic and Pragmatic Features of Speech Acts in Wulfstan's Homilies', in *Trends in Linguistics 83: Insights Into Germanic Linguistics I, Methodology in Transition*, ed. Irmengard Rauch and Gerald F. Carr (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995), pp. 109–25
- Hadley, D. M., *The Northern Danelaw: Its Social Structure, c.800–1100* (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 2000)
- Hall, Thomas N., 'Wulfstan's Latin Sermons', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 93–139
- Hamilton, Sarah, 'Rites for Public Penance in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield (London: Henry Bradshaw Society, 2005), pp. 65–103
- Hausherr, Irenée, 'De doctrina spirituali Christianorum orientalium quaestiones et scripta. 3. L'origine de la théorie orientale des huit péchés capitaux', *Orientalia Christiana* 30 (1933), 164–75
- Hickes, George, *Linguarum veterum septentrionalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archaeologicus* (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1705)
- Hill, Joyce, 'Ælfric, Authorial Identity, and the Changing Text', in *The Editing of Old English*, ed. D. G. Scragg and Paul E. Szarmach (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1994), pp. 177–89
- 'Ælfric and Wulfstan: Two Views of the Millennium', in *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes in Memory of Lynne Grundy*, ed. Jane Roberts and Janet Nelson (King's College London: Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, 2000), pp. 213–35
- 'Ælfric's "Silent Days"', *Leeds Studies in English* 16 (1985), 118–31
- 'The *Litaniae Maiores* and *Minores* in Rome, Francia and Anglo-Saxon England: Terminology, Texts and Translations', *Early Medieval Europe* 9 (2000), 211–46
- 'Monastic Reform and the Secular Church: Ælfric's Pastoral Letters in Context', in *England in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Carola Hicks (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1992), pp. 103–17

- Hollis, Stephanie, 'Napier XLII and Wulfstan's Homily V', *Notes and Queries* 42 (1995), 423–36
- 'The Thematic Structure of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*', *Anglo-Saxon England* 6 (1977), 175–95
- Hollowell, Ida M., 'Linguistic Factors Underlying Style Levels in Four Homilies of Wulfstan', *Neophilologus* 61 (1977), 287–93
- 'On the Two-Stress Theory of Wulfstan's Rhythm', *Philological Quarterly* 61 (1982), 1–11
- Jesch, Judith, 'Scandinavians and "Cultural Paganism" in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England: Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching*, ed. Paul Cavill (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2004), pp. 55–68
- Jolly, Karen Louise, *Popular Religion in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Elf-Charms in Context* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996)
- Jones, Christopher A., 'The Chrism Mass in Later Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield (London: Henry Bradshaw Society, 2005), pp. 105–42
- 'A Liturgical Miscellany in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 190', *Traditio* 54 (1990), 103–40
- 'Wulfstan's Liturgical Interests', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 325–52
- de Jong, Mayke, 'What was Public about Public Penance? *Paenitentia Publica* and Justice in the Carolingian World', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 44 (1997), 863–902
- Jost, Karl, 'Einige Wulfstantexte und ihre Quellen', *Anglia* 56 (1932), 265–315
- *Wulfstanstudien*, Swiss Studies in English 23 (Bern: Francke, 1950)
- Keefe, Susan A., *Water and the Word: Baptism and the Education of the Clergy in the Carolingian Empire* (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002)
- Keefer, Sarah Larratt, 'Ut in omnibus honorificetur Deus: The Corsnæd Ordeal in Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Community, the Family, and the Saint*, ed. Joyce Hill and Mary Swan (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), pp. 237–64
- Kennedy, A. G., 'Cnut's Law Code of 1018', *Anglo-Saxon England* 11 (1982), 239–64
- Ker, N. R., *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957; rev. imp. 1990)
- 'The Handwriting of Archbishop Wulfstan', in *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. Peter Clemoes and Kathleen Hughes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 315–31
- 'Hemming's Cartulary', in *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*, ed. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin, and R. W. Southern (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), pp. 49–75
- *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* (London: Offices of the Royal Society, 1941)
- Keynes, Simon, 'An Abbot, an Archbishop, and the Viking Raids of 1006–7 and 1009–12', *Anglo-Saxon England* 36 (2007), 151–220
- 'The Additions in Old English', in *The York Gospels: A Facsimile with Introductory Essays*, ed. Nicholas Barker (London: Roxburghe Club, 1987), pp. 81–99
- *The Diplomas of King Æthelred 'the Unready', 978–1016: A Study in their Use as Historical Evidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980)
- and Alfred P. Smyth, eds., *Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006)
- Kinard, James P., *A Study of Wulfstan's Homilies: Their Style and Sources* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1897)

- Kleist, Aaron J., 'The Division of the Ten Commandments in Anglo-Saxon England', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 103 (2002), 227–40
- ed., *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007)
- Landes, Richard, *Relics, Apocalypse, and the Death of History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995)
- Andrew Gow, and David C. van Meter, eds., *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950–1050* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
- Lawson, M. K., 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Homiletic Element in the Laws of Æthelred II and Cnut', in *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway*, ed. Alexander R. Rumble (London: Leicester University Press, 1994), pp. 141–64
- 'The Collection of Danegeld and Heregeld in the Reigns of Æthelred II and Cnut', *English Historical Review* 99 (1984), 721–38
- Lees, Clare A., *Tradition and Belief: Religious Writing in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1999)
- Letson, D. R., 'The Poetic Content of the Revival Homily', in *The Old English Homily and its Backgrounds*, ed. Bernard F. Huppé and Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: SUNY Press, 1978), pp. 139–56
- Lionarons, Joyce Tally, 'Napier Homily L: Wulfstan's Eschatology at the Close of his Career', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 413–28
- 'Textual Appropriation and Scribal (Re)Performance in a Composite Homily: The Case for a New Edition of Wulfstan's *De Temporibus Anticristi*', in *Old English Literature in its Manuscript Context*, ed. Joyce Tally Lionarons (Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press, 2004), pp. 67–93
- 'Textual Identity, Homiletic Reception, and Wulfstan's *Sermo ad Populum*', *Review of English Studies* 55 (2004), 157–82
- Mann, Gareth, 'The Development of Wulfstan's Alcuin Manuscript', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 235–78
- McGinn, Bernard, *Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil* (San Francisco: Harper, 1994)
- 'The End of the World and the Beginning of Christendom', in *Apocalypse Theory and the Ends of the World*, ed. Malcolm Bull (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), pp. 62–89
- *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979)
- McIntosh, Angus, 'Wulfstan's Prose', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 35 (1949), 109–42
- Meaney, Audrey L., '"And we forbeodað eornostlice ælcne hæðenscipe": Wulfstan and Late Anglo-Saxon and Norse Heathenism', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 461–500
- 'Old English Legal and Penitential Penalties for Heathenism', in *Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006), pp. 127–58
- Meens, Rob, 'The Frequency and Nature of Early Medieval Penance', in *Handling Sin: Confession in the Middle Ages*, ed. Peter Miller and A. J. Minnis, *York Studies in Medieval Theology* 2 (York: York Medieval Press, 1998), pp. 35–63
- Menner, R. J., 'Anglian and Saxon Elements in Wulfstan's Vocabulary', *Modern Language Notes* 63 (1948), 1–20
- Minnis, A. J., *The Medieval Theory of Authorship* (London: Scholar Press, 1984)
- Mitchell, Leonel L., *Baptismal Anointing* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1966, repr. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1978)

- Orchard, Andy, 'Crying Wolf: Oral Style and the *Sermones Lupi*', *Anglo-Saxon England* 21 (1992), 239–64
- 'On Editing Wulfstan', in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), pp. 311–40
- 'Oral Tradition', in *Approaches to Reading Old English Texts*, ed. Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 101–23
- 'Re-editing Wulfstan: Where's the Point?', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 63–91
- Ortenberg, Veronica, *The English Church and the Continent in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992)
- Page, R. I., *A Most Vile People: Early English Historians on the Vikings* (London: Viking Society for Northern Research, 1987)
- Peters, Edward, 'Mutations, Adjustments, Terrors, Historians, and the Year 1000', in *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium*, ed. Michael Frassetto (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), pp. 9–28
- Pfaff, Richard W., *The Anglo-Saxon Bishop and his Book*, Toller Memorial Lecture (repr. from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 81 (1999) Manchester: Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, nd)
- Pope, John C., Review of Dorothy Bethurum, *The Homilies of Wulfstan*, *Modern Language Notes* 74 (1959), 338–9
- Prescott, Andrew, 'The Structure of English Pre-Conquest Benedictionals', *British Library Journal* 13 (1987), 118–58
- Prideaux-Collins, William, "'Satan's Bonds are Extremely Loose": Apocalyptic Expectation in Anglo-Saxon England during the Millennial Era', in *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950–1050*, ed. Richard Landes, Andrew Gow, and David C. van Meter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 289–310
- Richards, Mary P., ed., *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Basic Readings* (New York and London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 171–92
- 'The Manuscript Contexts of the Old English Laws: Tradition and Innovation', in *Studies in Earlier English Prose*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: SUNY Press, 1986), pp. 171–92
- 'Wulfstan and the Millennium', in *The Year 1000: Religious and Social Response to the Turning of the First Millennium*, ed. Michael Frassetto (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), pp. 41–8
- Risden, Edward L., *Beasts of Time: Apocalyptic Beowulf* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994)
- Robinson, Fred, 'Old English Literature in its Most Immediate Context', in *Old English Literature in Context*, ed. John D. Niles. Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 1980: 11–29; 157–61
- Robinson, P. R., 'Self-Contained Units in Composite Manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Period', *Anglo-Saxon England* 7 (1978), 231–8
- Sauer, Hans, 'The Transmission and Structure of Archbishop Wulfstan's Commonplace Book', in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (New York: Garland, 2000), pp. 339–94
- 'Zur Überlieferung und Anlage von Erzbischof Wulfstans "Handbuch"', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 36 (1980), 341–84
- Scragg, D. G., 'The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric', *Anglo-Saxon England* 8 (1979), 223–77
- 'Napier's "Wulfstan" Homily XXX: Its Sources, its Relationship to the Vercelli Book and its Style', *Anglo-Saxon England* 6 (1977), 197–211

- Scragg, D. G., and Paul E. Szarmach, eds., *The Editing of Old English: Papers from the 1990 Manchester Conference* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1994)
- Stanton, Robert, *The Culture of Translation in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2002)
- Stenton, Frank, *Anglo-Saxon England* (3rd edn, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971)
- Stuart, C. I. J. M., 'Wulfstan's Use of *Leofan Men*', *English Studies* 45 (1964), 39–42
- Szarmach, Paul E., ed., *Old English Prose: Basic Readings* (New York: Garland, 2000)
- ed., *Studies in Earlier English Prose* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1986)
- 'Another Old English Translation of Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*?', *English Studies* 62 (1981), 97–109
- Townend, Matthew, ed., *Language and History in Viking Age England: Linguistic Relations between Speakers of Old Norse and Old English* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002)
- *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004)
- Turner, C. H., *Early Worcester Manuscripts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916)
- Tunberg, Jennifer Morrish, 'Physical Description', in *The Copenhagen Wulfstan Collection: Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek Gl. Kgl. Sam. 1595*, ed. James E. Cross and Jennifer Morrish Tunberg, *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile* 25 (Copenhagen: Roskilde and Bagger, 1993), pp. 24–8
- Ure, James M., 'Review of Dorothy Bethurum, *The Homilies of Wulfstan*', *Medium Ævum* 28 (1959), 112–15
- Verhelst, David, 'Adso of Montier-en-Der and the Fear of the Year 1000', in *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950–1050*, ed. Richard Landes, Andrew Gow, and David C. van Meter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 81–92
- Vykoukal, E., 'Les examens du clergé paroissial à l'époque carolingienne', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 14 (1913), 81–96
- Way, A., *Catalogue of Antiquities, Coins, Pictures, and Miscellaneous Curiosities in the Possession of the Society of Antiquaries of London* (London, 1847)
- Wenzel, Siegfried, *The Sin of Sloth: Acedia in Medieval Thought and Literature* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1967)
- Whitbread, L., 'MS. C.C.C.C. 201: A Note on its Character and Provenance', *Philological Quarterly* 38 (1959), 106–12
- 'Wulfstan's Homilies XXIX, XXX, and Some Related Texts', *Anglia* 81 (1963), 347–64
- Whitelock, Dorothy, 'Archbishop Wulfstan, Homilist and Statesman', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ser. I, v. 24 (1942), 24–45
- 'A Note on the Career of Wulfstan the Homilist', *English Historical Review* 52 (1937), 460–6
- Review of *Die 'Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical': Ein Werk Erzbischof Wulfstans von York*, ed. K. Jost, *Review of English Studies* 12 (1961), 61–6
- 'Some Anglo-Saxon Bishops of London', in *History, Law and Literature in 10th–11th Century England* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1981)
- 'Wulfstan's Authorship of Cnut's Laws', *English Historical Review* 70 (1955), 72–55
- 'Wulfstan and the Laws of Cnut', *English Historical Review* 63 (1948), 433–52
- 'Wulfstan and the So-Called Laws of Edward and Guthrum', *English Historical Review* 56 (1941), 1–21

Bibliography

- Whitlock, Dorothy, 'Wulfstan at York', in *Franciplegius: Medieval and Linguistic Studies in Honour of Francis Peabody Magoun, Jr*, ed. Jess B. Bessinger and Robert P. Creed (New York: New York University Press, 1965), pp. 214–31
- Wilcox, Jonathan, 'The Dissemination of Wulfstan's Homilies: The Wulfstan Tradition in Eleventh-Century Vernacular Preaching', in *England in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Carola Hicks (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1992), pp. 199–217
- 'Napier's 'Wulfstan' Homilies XL and XLII: Two Anonymous Works from Winchester?', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 90 (1991), 1–19
- 'The Wolf on Shepherds: Wulfstan, Bishops, and the Context of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*', in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (New York: Garland, 2000), pp. 395–418
- 'Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* as Political Performance', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 375–96.
- Williams, Ann, *Æthelred the Unready: The Ill-Counselled King* (London and New York: Hambledon and London, 2003)
- Wormald, Patrick, 'The Uses of Literacy in Anglo-Saxon England and its Neighbours', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser. 27 (1977), 95–114
- 'Æthelred the Lawmaker', in *Æthelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*, British Archaeological Reports 59 (Oxford, 1978), pp. 47–80
- 'Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh-Century State-BUILDER', in Townend, *Wulfstan*, pp. 9–27
- 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Holiness of Society', in *Anglo-Saxon History: Basic Readings*, ed. David A. E. Pelteret (New York: Garland, 2000), pp. 191–224
- *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century, Vol. I, Legislation and its Limits* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999)
- 'Quadripartitus', in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. George Garnett and John Hudson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 111–47
- Yerkes, David, 'The Place of Composition of the Opening of Napier Homily I', *Neophilologus* 60 (1976), 452–4
- Zumthor, Paul, *Essai de poétique médiéval* (Paris: Seuil, 1987)

Index

- Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Près · 16,
18–19, 48, 53–5, 63, 141–2
- Adso of Montier-en-Der · 18, 21, 48,
55–6, 58–62, 66, 69, 92
- Ælfric · 1, 5, 6, 10–11, 13–14, 16–20, 22,
24, 27, 39, 43, 57, 59, 68, 72, 75, 79, 83,
87, 104, 107, 139, 165
- Catholic Homilies · 12, 82
- Colloquy · 16
- De die iudicii* · 52, 67, 68
- De ecclesiastica consuetudine* · 97, 100–1
- De falsis diis* · 104–6
- De initio creaturae* · 70, 82–5, 88–90
- De septiformi spiritu* · 130–1
- Decalogus Moysi* · 95
- Dominica in media quadragesime* · 96–7
- Dominica xvii post pentecosten* · 136
- Feria III de dominica oratione* · 87–8
- First Old English letter · 14, 16, 80, 124
- Hexameron* · 19
- Homily for Ash Wednesday · 139
- In dedicatione ecclesiae* · 109–10
- Letter to the Monks of Eynsham · 139
- Letter to Wulfsgie · 79–80, 124
- Old English letters · 172
- Passio Petri et Pauli* · 63–6
- Preface to Catholic Homilies · 58–61, 67
- Preface to the Grammar · 80
- revised Preface to Catholic Homilies
· 67–9
- Second Old English letter · 16, 81, 97,
128, 139
- Third pastoral letter · 16
- Ælfric · 9
- Æthelnoth · 9
- Æthelred · 3, 10, 30, 98, 145, 149, 150–2, 155
- Æthelred clause · 150, 152–6, 160
- Alcuin · 18, 157
- De baptismi caeremoniis* · 126
- De uirtutibus et vitiis* · 97
- De uirtutibus et vitiis* · 15
- letters · 21, 125, 151
- Alfred
- Preface to Pastoral Care · 80
- alienation of Church property · 93,
98–100
- allegory · 28, 54, 63
- alliteration · 10, 32, 73, 93, 104, 112, 134,
148, 151
- Amalarius of Metz · 18, 41, 77, 91, 126
- Ambrose · 48
- Anglo-Saxon Chronicle · 9, 98
- Antichrist · 4–5, 45, 46–70, 73–4, 83–4,
107, 113, 131, 132, 136, 156–9, 163–4,
173–5
- birth of · 58–60, 69
- death of · 66
- definition of · 55
- history of · 58–9
- length of reign · 56, 69
- miracles of · 60–2
- power of · 60–1
- time of · 61, 84
- antichrists · 56–7, 131, 156
- Antiochus Epiphanes · 45
- Apollonius of Tyre · 14, 41
- Apostle's Creed · 6, 76, 78, 82, 85–9, 91–2,
107, 119–22, 128–9, 167
- archbishops
- responsibilities of · 108
- Atto of Vercelli · 93, 97, 100
- Augustine of Hippo · 43, 46, 48, 55, 128
- De civitate dei* · 44
- authorship · 22, 23–6, 30, 33, 38, 42, 72,
133
- baptism · 1, 7, 29, 78, 87, 108–10, 118–20,
123–9, 132, 135, 143
- adult · 7, 123, 125–6, 128–9
- infant · 7, 123–6, 129
- Baxter, Stephen · 99
- Bede · 3, 48, 87
- De temporum ratione* · 44
- Bedingfield, Brad · 138–9, 141
- Benedictine Office · 14, 41, 77
- Benedictine Reform · 75–6, 80, 169
- Benedictine Rule · 16, 93, 98
- Benedictional of Archbishop Robert · 138

- Bethurum, Dorothy · 1, 2, 4, 6-7, 13-15,
17, 19, 22-7, 29-35, 41, 45, 49, 52, 54-5,
57, 62, 63, 70, 72, 76-7, 83-4, 86, 88, 91,
99, 102, 104-5, 109, 112-13, 117, 124-6,
129, 131, 141-2, 147-9, 151-2, 162, 166,
171-4
- betrayal of lords · 150, 154, 159
- bishops · 15, 39, 81, 100, 111-16, 131, 135,
137, 139, 143, 150, 155
behavior of · 39, 41, 113
consecration of · 6, 9, 32, 75, 111, 115
history of · 113-15, 143
obedience to · 114-16
responsibilities of · 75, 111, 115, 123-4
rights of · 97
sinful · 115-16
- Blair, John · 98
- Blickling Homilies
Blickling VII · 43
Blickling X · 43
Blickling XI · 46-7
Blickling XV · 63-4, 66
- Boniface · 77, 111-12, 115
- bootless crimes · 171
- breakdown of society · 56, 58, 69, 159,
163
- Budny, Mildred · 13-14
- Byrhtferth of Ramsey · 33, 149, 160-1
- Caesarius of Arles · 83, 93
- Canons of Edgar · 14, 37, 77, 109, 118,
124
- Canterbury Benedictinal · 138-9
- Carolingian dichotomy · 136, 139
- Cassian, John · 96
- catechetical homilies · 5, 76, 118, 147
- catechumen · 126, 128-9
- Charlemagne · 125
- Chronicle poems · 98
- church dues · 3, 35, 103, 118, 164-5,
168-70
churchbot · 169
churchscot · 169-70
lightscot · 169-70
plough-alms · 169
ploughscot · 170
Romfeoh · 169-70
soulsot · 169
- clerical celibacy · 3, 39, 72, 77, 173-5
- Cnut · 2-4, 7, 9-10, 17, 29, 35, 71, 99, 109,
152-3, 160, 163, 168, 171, 173
- commonplace book · 2, 12, 15, 18-20, 22,
48, 77, 100-1, 133, 135, 137, 141
- communion of saints · 91, 93
- Confessionale Pseudo-Ecgberti* · 19, 87
- confirmation · 7, 75, 108, 123-8, 130-2
- Copenhagen fragment · 20, 36, 147
- Cotton, Robert · 15
- Council of Chelsea · 21, 124
- Council of Clotesho · 78
- Council of Nimes · 91
- Cramer, Peter · 132
- Cross, J. E. · 27, 42, 102, 125-6
- Cubitt, Catherine · 133
- Dagenais, John · 25
- Danish invasions · 3-5, 7, 30, 43-4, 52-3,
55, 73, 85, 98-9, 132, 144-51, 153-61,
163, 168, 175
- De ecclesiasticis gradibus* · 19, 79
- de Jong, Mayke · 132, 136
- De letania maiore · 22, 92
- deception · 48-51, 54, 58, 60-2, 66, 88,
131-2, 162-3, 174
- degeneration of human beings · 73
- degeneration of the world · 5, 52-3, 55,
57, 67, 71, 73-4
- despoliation of churches · 100
- Dialogus Ecgberti* · 137
- disloyalty in families · 56, 69
- Dumville, David · 18
- editorial theory · 2, 22-4, 27
- Edmund · 10
- education of clergy · 1, 6, 39, 76-8, 80-1,
85, 164
- Egils saga* · 106
- eight capital sins · 78, 81, 93-7, 107, 129,
149, 160-1
- Ely · 9-10
- Emmerson, Richard K. · 48
- Enoch and Elias · 56-7, 65, 67, 69
- eschatological homilies · 2, 4-5, 33, 43,
45, 47, 49, 50, 52, 55, 67, 70, 73-4, 83-5,
88, 92, 127, 131-2, 154, 155-9, 161, 168,
171-2
- eschatology · 1, 3, 4, 7, 43, 46, 50, 55,
70-1, 73-4, 107, 131, 156, 158, 160-1,
173-4
- eucharist · 91, 123, 129
- Evagrius of Pontus · 95-6
- Excerptiones Pseudo-Ecgberti* · 16, 77, 103
- exempla · 31, 62-3, 66-7
- exorcism · 64, 127, 129
- false prophets · 48-9, 50-1, 55
- feasts and fasts · 3, 97, 173
- Fisher, J. D. C. · 124
- Fowler, Roger · 38, 133-5
- Frantzen, Allen · 136, 141, 146

- Gatch, Milton McC. · 43, 47, 50, 52, 55
 genre · 2, 7, 24–6, 29, 33–4, 40, 42, 144,
 164–5, 170
 gifts of the Holy Spirit · 96, 123, 125–6,
 130, 132
 Gildas · 152–3, 157, 159
 Gneuss, Helmut · 13, 21, 109
 Godden, Malcolm · 3, 7, 43, 45–6, 51–2,
 57, 59, 70, 83, 104, 151, 154–5, 157–8
 Gregory the Great · 43, 48, 55, 57, 96,
 100, 111, 166
Dialogues · 28–9
Moralia in Job · 56, 96
- Hall, Thomas N. · 27, 42, 83, 102, 147
 Hamilton, Sarah · 138–140
 heathenism · 6, 35, 76, 85, 102–3, 105–7,
 127–8. *See also* paganism.
 Hemming's Cartulary · 21, 99
heregeld · 98–9
 Hill, Joyce · 24, 47, 79–81
 Hollis, Stephanie Dien · 151–4, 156, 158–9
 Holy Society · 3, 5, 8, 160, 163, 168, 175
 homilies
 Bethurum Ia · 20, 49, 50, 55–6, 69, 156
 Bethurum Ib · 5, 17, 21, 49, 50, 55–7,
 71, 73, 83, 131
 Bethurum II · 49–52, 55, 68
 Bethurum III · 15, 49, 50, 52–5, 63, 69,
 74, 92, 106, 172–3
 Bethurum IV · 17, 23, 25, 49–50, 58,
 60–3, 66–7, 69, 71
 Bethurum IX · 71, 130–2, 147, 159
 Bethurum V · 5, 17, 43, 47, 49–50, 58,
 67–71, 73–4, 83, 106, 150
 Bethurum VI · 4, 14, 17, 24, 70, 76,
 82–6, 88–9, 92–3, 104, 106, 150,
 157–8, 166
 Bethurum VII · 14, 23, 76, 82, 85–93,
 104, 106
 Bethurum VIIa · 82, 86–8, 119
 Bethurum VIIa · 18–20, 22, 125–7
 Bethurum VIIb · 19, 125–7
 Bethurum VIIc · 14, 16, 21, 40, 77, 82,
 104, 125–9, 147, 150
 Bethurum Xa · 17, 41, 77, 93
 Bethurum Xb · 41, 49, 93–4, 97, 100–2
 Bethurum Xc · 13–14, 16, 41, 49, 93–7,
 101–2, 117, 129, 147, 161, 166
 Bethurum XI · 36, 147–9, 157
 Bethurum XII · 104–6
 Bethurum XIII · 6, 14, 16, 21, 23, 29,
 72, 82, 86, 116–22, 168
 Bethurum XIV · 38, 132, 138, 141–2,
 144
- Bethurum XIX · 16–17, 120, 148–9,
 157, 162
 Bethurum XV · 16, 19, 132, 137, 139,
 141–4
 Bethurum XVIa · 16, 111
 Bethurum XVIIb · 16, 111–13, 115
 Bethurum XVII · 6, 20, 23, 32, 109,
 111–16, 150
 Bethurum XVIII · 20, 109–10
 Bethurum XVIII · 111
 Bethurum XXI · 16, 26, 120, 150, 161–3
 Bethurum XXVI · 22
 Napier 1 · 13–14, 21, 25, 28–9, 92
 Napier 22 · 21, 164, 169–70
 Napier 23 · 14, 16, 27, 29, 86, 117–18,
 120, 164, 168–70
 Napier 24 · 14, 16, 27, 29, 86, 117–19,
 121–2
 Napier 25 · 14, 16, 29, 86, 119–22
 Napier 26 · 16, 87, 119, 121–2
 Napier 27 · 7, 14, 16, 20, 30, 120–1,
 149, 160
 Napier 34 · 149
 Napier 35 · 7, 13–14, 30–2, 38, 120–1,
 132, 144–5
 Napier 36 · 7, 16, 30–1, 42, 121, 144,
 166
 Napier 37 · 32, 112–13
 Napier 38 · 14, 32–3, 42, 120
 Napier 39 · 30, 38, 120, 132, 144–5
 Napier 40 · 22, 71–2, 82, 93, 130–1
 Napier 42 · 22, 48, 66, 92
 Napier 43 · 92
 Napier 45 · 150
 Napier 46 · 40
 Napier 47 · 14, 33, 42, 149, 160–1, 163
 Napier 50 · 4–5, 7, 15, 26–7, 30, 33–4,
 43, 49, 71–4, 92, 160–1, 163–4, 170–5
 Napier 51 · 7, 16, 25, 34, 121, 166,
 170–1, 173
 Napier 52 · 16, 34, 121, 164–6
 Napier 53 · 34, 121, 164–6
 Napier 55 · 22
 Napier 57 · 92
 Napier 59 · 17, 25, 32, 35, 164, 166–8
 Napier 60 · 17, 26, 35, 92, 103, 168
 Napier 61 · 17, 26, 35, 103, 164, 168,
 170
Sermo Lupi · 3–5, 7, 13–14, 16–17,
 30, 33, 38, 43, 56, 70, 73–4, 82, 85,
 92, 100, 103, 149–52, 154–63, 168,
 171–2, 175
Sermo Lupi BH · 7, 150, 152–8, 160
Sermo Lupi C · 30, 150–6
Sermo Lupi EI · 7, 150–6, 158, 160

- Howe, Nicholas · 157–8
Hrabanus Maurus · 18
hypocrisy · 49, 54, 131–2, 148, 174–5
- Images of Wulfstan · 9
Institutes of Polity · 2, 3, 5, 7, 14–15, 17, 26, 28, 32–4, 37–9, 77, 87, 109, 112–13, 134, 144, 150, 164–6, 171–2, 174
Appendix A · 37, 145, 167
Appendix B · 38, 133–4
Appendix C · 38, 134–5
Appendix D · 37, 134
Appendix E · 39, 41
Appendix F · 39, 40–2, 77
Appendix G · 40–2, 79
Appendix H · 37, 40
Appendix I · 41–2, 77
Appendix K · 41–2
Appendix L · 41–2
interrogationes sacerdotales · 78
Isidore of Seville · 48, 55, 125
Israelites · 31, 43, 70, 84–5, 95–6, 147–9, 157
- Jerome · 48, 123
Jesch, Judith · 102–3
Jesse of Amiens · 125
Jolly, Karen Louise · 5, 79
Jones, Christopher A. · 77–8, 109, 126, 139
Joscelyn, John · 13, 15
Jost, Karl · 1, 2, 23, 30–1, 33, 35–42, 63, 71–2, 77, 125, 161, 170–2, 174
- Keefe, Susan A. · 77
Ker, Neil · 12–13, 18, 20, 22, 36–7, 103, 119, 122, 127, 150, 172
Keynes, Simon · 35, 144, 155
Kienzle, Beverly Mayne · 28
- lænland* · 98–9
Last Judgment · 4, 43, 45, 50, 52, 61, 82, 84, 88, 120, 161, 165, 174
Late Old English Handbook for a Confessor · 7, 38, 133–5, 138
Latin homilies · 27, 42, 102
law codes · 2, 3, 5, 7, 14, 25, 28, 77, 92, 164
 Að · 14, 19
 Alfred · 140
 Alfred and Ine · 15
 Geðyncðo · 14, 41
 Grið · 15, 32, 41
 Hadbot · 14, 19
 I Æthelstan · 14, 15, 169
 I Cnut · 4, 14–15, 34, 79, 118, 166–7, 172–3
- I Edmund · 14–15, 169
II Æthelstan · 140
II Athelstan · 140
II Cnut · 3, 14–15, 34, 41, 106, 140–1, 171
II Edgar · 14–15, 78, 169
II Edmund · 140
III Edgar · 14–15
Ine · 124
IV Edgar · 19
IX Æthelred · 170–1
Mirce · 19
Mircna laga · 14
Norðhymbra cyricgrið · 16
Norðleoda laga · 14
Northumbrian Priests' Law · 14
Quadripartitus · 30, 144
V Æthelred · 3, 14–15, 34, 140, 171
V Atr · 141
VI Æthelred · 14, 100, 134, 166–8, 170–2, 174
VII Æthelred · 7, 14, 30, 79, 132, 144
VIII Æthelred · 14–15, 38, 100, 162, 170–1
X Æthelred · 170–1
- Lees, Clare · 11, 44, 76, 83, 105, 144, 146
Leofric · 18
Leofric Missal · 138–9
Liber Eliensis · 9–10
Liber Wigorniensis · 100
Liebermann, Felix · 15, 41, 100
- magic · 63, 65–7
manuscripts · 1, 10, 12
 Ashmolean 328 · 149
 Barlow 37 · 12, 22, 77, 125, 135, 152
 BL Add. 38651 · 12, 22, 37
 Bodley 343 · 12, 16–17, 49, 62, 82, 127, 149–50
 Bodley 579 · 138
 Bodley 718 · 135
 Boulogne-sur-Mer 63 · 95, 100
 Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 8558–63 · 133, 135
 Cambridge, Pembroke 25 · 77
 Cambridge, St John's College, 42 · 49
 Cambridge, Trinity College B.15.34 · 130
 CCCC 146 · 138
 CCCC 163 · 138–9
 CCCC 178 · 104
 CCCC 190 · 12, 18–19, 40, 48, 77, 79, 95, 97–8, 100, 109, 111, 125, 141–2
 CCCC 201 · 12, 13–14, 26, 28–30, 32, 40–1, 49, 62, 71, 77, 79, 82, 86–7,

- 90–1, 93, 97, 100–1, 111–13, 116–22,
125, 127, 130, 133, 135, 144–5,
147–51, 160–2, 168–9, 172
CCCC 265 · 12, 19, 77, 111, 125, 133,
135, 151
CCCC 302 · 12, 19, 126
CCCC 303 · 104
CCCC 419 · 12, 14, 16, 29, 33, 48, 71,
82, 85–6, 90, 93, 101, 116–19, 121–2,
127, 130–1, 149–50, 160, 168
CCCC 421 · 12, 14, 33, 49, 172–3
Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek Gl.
Kgl. S.1595 · 12, 20, 36, 49, 77, 125,
141, 147
Cotton Claudius A.iii · 108, 133
Cotton Cleopatra B.xiii · 12, 20, 30, 32,
71, 109, 113, 114–16, 149, 160
Cotton Julius E.vii · 104
Cotton Nero A.i · 12, 15, 16, 22, 26, 37,
39, 41, 93, 98, 101, 111, 141, 148–51,
154–5, 161–2, 164
Cotton Otho B.x · 12, 20, 116–17, 127,
133
Cotton Tiberius A.iii · 12, 16, 29–30,
34–5, 86–7, 116, 118, 121–2, 133,
135, 160, 164, 168, 170
Cotton Tiberius A.xiii · 12, 21, 28–9
Cotton Tiberius C.vi · 130
Cotton Vespasian A.xiv · 12, 21, 22, 37
Cotton Vespasian D.ii · 12, 21, 48–9
Cotton Vespasian D.xiv · 104
Cotton Vespasian D.xx · 136
Cotton Vitellius A.vii · 141
Cotton Vitellius E.xii · 138
CUL Add. 3206 · 38, 133–4
CUL li.l.33 · 104, 133
Exeter Cathedral Library 3501 · 18
Harley 55 · 100
Hatton 113 · 12–15, 17, 22, 26, 28–30,
32, 49–50, 62, 71, 82, 86–7, 90–1, 93,
100–1, 104, 112–14, 116, 118–19,
121–2, 127, 130, 141, 144–5, 147,
149, 150–1, 161–2, 172
Hatton 114 · 12, 13, 17, 22, 48, 92, 109
Hatton 115 · 77
Hatton 116 · 104, 130
Junius 121 · 7, 12, 17, 33, 37–41, 77, 79,
86–7, 109, 119, 121, 133–4, 144–5,
148, 162
Junius 23 · 130
Junius 24 · 130
Lambeth Palace 489 · 20
Laud Misc. 482 · 133, 135
Madrid, Real Biblioteca del Escorial
T.I.12 · 49
Oxford, Bodleian, Gough Maps 225 · 9
Oxford, Bodleian, Top. Eccles. d.6 · 9
Paris, BN lat. 3182 · 135
Paris, BN lat. 7585 · 104
Paris, BN, lat. 10575 · 108
Rouen, BM 1382 · 135
York Minster Add. 1 · 12, 17, 35, 103,
166, 168
marriage · 35, 140, 167, 175
Martin of Braga · 93, 106
Meaney, Audrey · 103
Meens, Rob · 136
migration myth · 157–8
millennial year · 44–7, 52, 68, 70
Minnis, A. J. · 25
miracles · 10, 49, 54, 58, 60, 62–6, 69,
84–5, 88, 89–90, 93
mouvance · 24–5
Napier, Arthur · 1, 13, 14–15, 22–3
necessity of preaching · 5, 56, 73, 82, 111,
115, 145
negligent priests · 80, 83, 109, 111, 113
Nero · 63–4
New Testament paradigm · 3–5, 7, 85
Nicene Creed · 17
Old English Rule of Chrodegang · 19,
140
Old Testament paradigm · 4, 5, 7, 85,
157–60
Orchard, Andy · 6, 11, 26, 105, 130, 162–3
order of composition · 6, 7, 49–50, 101,
147, 150, 152, 162–3
Ordo Romanus · 125
Origen · 95–6
Oswald memorandum · 100
paganism · 75–6, 102, 104–7, 128. *See also*
heathenism.
paranomasia · 11, 51, 134
Parker, Matthew · 13–15, 19, 173
Pastoral Letter · 6, 21, 29, 34, 72, 82, 86–7,
92–3, 116, 120, 122, 153, 160, 164, 168
Pater Noster · 6, 76, 78, 82, 86–8, 107,
122, 128–9, 167
Paul the Deacon · 59
penance · 1, 3, 7, 32, 97, 123, 132, 134,
146–7
communal · 7, 123, 132, 136, 144–6
commutation of · 133, 135
medical analogy · 134–6, 141
mixed · 139–140
private · 7, 123, 132–4, 136–7, 140, 143
public · 7, 109, 123, 132, 136–44

- penitential edict · 7, 30, 132, 144, 146–7
 penitentials
 Halitgar · 87, 111, 139
 Pseudo-Ecgbert · 19, 133, 135, 137–40, 165
 Pseudo-Theodore · 18
 Theodore · 137
 performativity · 6, 11, 94, 115–16
 Peter and Paul · 62–5, 67
 Peterborough · 9
 Peters, Edward · 44
 Pirmin of Reichenau · 82–3, 93, 97–8, 100, 129
 pontificals · 108
 Anderson · 138
 Claudius Pontifical I · 108–9, 138–9
 Ecgbert · 138
 Egbert · 138
 Egbert Pontifical · 108
 Lanalet · 138–9
 Pseudo-Ecgbert · 40
 Ramsey · 138–9
 Samson · 138–9
 Sherborne · 138
 Pope, John C. · 63, 104
 prerequisites for clerical office · 78–9
 Prideaux-Collins, William · 47
 process of composition · 1, 6, 24, 26–7, 30, 36, 42, 50, 101, 119, 154–5, 157, 166
 proprietary churches · 78, 81, 98
 protection of the church · 97–8, 100, 168, 173
 Pseudo-Marcellus · 63, 65–6

 Rabanus Maurus · 92
Regularis concordia · 16
 repetition · 11, 26, 57, 88, 112, 133–4, 157, 174
 responsibilities of priests · 165–7
 Richards, Mary · 14, 43–4
 Rogationtide · 92
 Romscoth · 15

 sabbatical millennialism · 33, 44–5, 47, 67, 160–1
 salvation history · 6, 75, 78, 82–3, 85, 88, 105, 107
 Sauer, Hans · 125
 Scragg, D. G. · 19, 109
 seven grades of clerical office · 40, 78–9
 signs of the end · 44–7, 49–50, 52–5, 68–70, 84, 172–3
 silent days · 139

 Simon Magus · 62, 63–7
 sinful priests · 128–9, 165–6
 St Wulfstan · 13, 141
 St Wulfstan's homiliary · 13, 22
 Stanton, Robert · 80
 style · 10–11, 31, 33, 88, 147–8
 Sulpicius Severus · 48
 Swan, Mary · 11
 synod · 15, 39
 Szarmach, Paul · 28

 ten commandments · 81, 93–6, 107, 129, 142
 Testament of Reuben · 95
 Theodulf of Orléans · 125–6
 Theodulf's *Capitula* · 40
 Thorpe, Benjamin · 38, 41
 tithes · 3, 35, 118, 141–2, 164–5, 168–70
 tremulous Worcester hand · 13, 17
 two-stress rhythm · 10, 11, 16, 26, 134

 Vercelli Homilies
 Vercelli II · 43, 82, 130
 Vercelli IV · 43
 Vercelli IX · 43
 Verhelst, David · 46, 59
Viga-Glúms saga · 106
Vita sancti Dunstani · 20
 vocabulary · 10, 30, 31, 72–3, 88, 90, 134

 Wenzel, Siegfried · 95
 werewolf · 112–13
 Whitelock, Dorothy · 1, 3, 23, 39–40, 99, 102, 149, 152, 169
 Wilcox, Jonathan · 2, 17, 23, 27–33, 37, 40–2, 71–2, 77, 97, 112, 134, 154–6, 160
 William of Malmesbury · 99
 witchcraft · 104, 106–7, 128
 Wormald, C. P. · 75
 Wormald, Patrick · 1–4, 8, 19, 24, 30, 34, 108, 140, 144–5, 147, 162, 169–71, 173
 Wulfgeat · 13, 17, 22, 119, 141
 Wulfsgie of Sherborne · 79, 81
 Wulfstan as teacher · 5–7, 11, 75–6, 85, 123
 Wulfstan canon · 1, 2, 10, 22–3, 25–30, 32, 35–6, 41–2, 54, 72
 Wulfstan hand · 1, 12, 16, 18, 20–2, 28, 32, 35–7, 94, 98, 101, 103, 147, 149, 151, 154–5, 162, 166
 Wulfstan imitator · 2, 72, 171

 York Gospels · 17, 25, 35

ANGLO-SAXON STUDIES

Volume 1: The Dramatic Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England
M. Bradford Bedingfield

Volume 2: The Art of the Anglo-Saxon Goldsmith: Fine Metalwork
in Anglo-Saxon England: its Practice and Practitioners
Elizabeth Coatsworth and Michael Pinder

Volume 3: The Ruler Portraits of Anglo-Saxon England
Catherine E. Karkov

Volume 4: Dying and Death in Later Anglo-Saxon England
Victoria Thompson

Volume 5: Landscapes of Monastic Foundation:
The Establishment of Religious Houses in East Anglia, c. 650–1200
Tim Pestell

Volume 6: Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England
Edited by Francesca Tinti

Volume 7: Episcopal Culture in Late Anglo-Saxon England
Mary Frances Giandrea

Volume 8: Elves in Anglo-Saxon England:
Matters of Belief, Health, Gender and Identity
Alaric Hall

Volume 9: Feasting the Dead:
Food and Drink in Anglo-Saxon Burial Rituals
Christina Lee

Volume 10: Anglo-Saxon Button Brooches:
Typology, Genealogy, Chronology
Seiichi Suzuki

Volume 11: Wasperton: A Roman, British and Anglo-Saxon
Community in Central England
edited by Martin Carver with Catherine Hills and Jonathan Scheschkewitz

Volume 12: A Companion to Bede
George Hardin Brown

Volume 13: Trees in Anglo-Saxon England:
Literature, Law and Landscape
Della Hooke

The prodigious writings of Archbishop Wulfstan (d. 1023) encompass secular laws, religious canons, political theory, and homilies (sermons); despite their importance, the homilies have not received the critical attention they deserve, a gap which this book seeks to fill. It focuses on three particular aspects: the re-establishment of the Wulfstan homiletic canon, Wulfstan's processes of composition and revision as manifested in their manuscript variants, and Wulfstan's characteristic themes and concerns. These include adherence to secular and divine law; the keeping of Christian feasts and fasts; the payment of church dues and tithes; social justice for the poor; absolute clerical celibacy and sexual continence for the laity; repentance, prayer and penance; and the continual reminder, both pre- and post-millennium, that the end of the world is close at hand. Wulfstan's homilies indicate that for the English to heed his warnings, they would have to be persuaded or if necessary legally coerced to adhere to the dictates of what Patrick Wormald has called a 'Holy Society'; and their influence can be seen in his law codes, where the book argues that even in coercion the archbishop sought to teach and to persuade.

JOYCE TALLY LIONARONS teaches in the English Department at Ursinus College, Pennsylvania.

Series: Anglo-Saxon Studies

 D.S. BREWER
An imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd
PO Box 9, Woodbridge IP12 3DF (GB) and
668 Mt Hope Ave, Rochester NY 14620-2731 (US)
www.boydellandbrewer.com

